THE STRUCTURE OF POWERLESSNESS

By

WILLIAM A. BRUCK

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE
COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Introduction	9
Existential Analyses of Power	12
Traditional Studies of Powerlessness	19
Traditional Studies of Power	26
Conclusion	53
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	55
Introduction	55
Phenomenological Method: General	59
Data Collection	65
Protocol Analysis	70
Final Analysis	75
Factor Analytic Method	77
CHAPTER IV: PHENOMENOLOGICAL RESULTS	84
Introduction	84
Sample Data Analysis	88
Other Data and Results	101
General Data Analysis	111
General Results	127

CHAPTER V: FACTOR ANALYTIC RESULTS 132

Introduction 132

Classification of Situations 134

Factor Analysis of all Subjects 135

Factor Analysis by Sex 143

Factor analysis by situation 145

Test Retest Reliability 146

CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSION 147

Introduction 147

Phenomenological Results 148

Factor Analytic Results 157

Combination of Results 168

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE ON POWERLESSNESS 179

APPENDIX 2: HYPOTHETICAL CONSTRUCTS 182

APPENDIX 3: MULTIPLE AFFECT ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST (Today Form) 185

APPENDIX 4: ITEMS LOADING ON EACH FACTOR 188

BIBLIOGRAPHY 196

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 200

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE STRUCTURE OF POWERLESSNESS

By

William A. Bruck

December, 1977

Chairperson: Harry Grater
Major Department: Psychology

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the structure of the experience of powerlessness: the phenomenological description and the factor analytic structure of it. Two separate studies were conducted. In the first, descriptions of the experience were obtained from subjects (and the investigator himself) and subjected to a phenomenological reduction and analysis. This resulted in a fundamental description of the phenomenon (describing the experience itself) and a fundamental structure (giving its existential significance). This fundamental description indicated that powerlessness occurs when a subject experiences something in relation to which he/she is out of control; a reflective or pre-reflective project of his/hers is thwarted. The subject experiences him/herself as powerless as he/she finds no way to regain control - no viable alternative courses of action exist. The subject responds emotionally to the situation, often with a bursting out of anger or rage, or with the pulling inwards of

depression or despair. If the experience is intense, he/she may be pulled out of the everyday world into what may be metaphorically termed a "magical" world. In this, his/her everyday concerns and goals lose importance in the face of the powerless event; he/she is isolated from others who do not share this magical space, and time seems to slow down and stop. Alternative modes of resolution are described. The existential significance of this experience is interpreted as personal dis-affirmation. In the second study a questionnaire was developed on the basis of the phenomenological results and administered to 194 undergraduate students at the University of Florida, asking them questions about situations in which they felt powerless. The results were factor analysed. This resulted in a factor analytic structure consisting of a general factor of powerlessness, plus factors of angry/mobility, dis-affirmation, depression, isolation and stuckness. Results of the two studies were compared, and ways in which each added to the other were examined. The phenomenological study was interpreted as adding <u>depth</u> to the understanding of powerlessness (increased depth of the interviews with subjects, showing interrelations between factors); whereas the factor analysis added <u>breadth</u> to the understanding of powerlessness (estimates of reliability and validity, large subject pool, discussion of different types of powerless experiencing). Suggestions for further study were made.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The phenomena of power and powerlessness have intrigued me for several years. In beginning to think about power and powerlessness I note that I am interested in these concepts for several reasons. First, in my beginning experience as a therapist I have noticed that my clients almost universally experience themselves as powerless in important aspects of their lives - powerless to gain friends, powerless to stop acting clumsy, powerless with their parents, powerless to feel certain emotions, etc. I also notice that in my own life, when I face situations that are problematic for me, and I feel anxious, resentful or depressed, the experience of powerlessness often accompanies these feelings. In reading many theories of personality, I have noticed a theme of power, control and responsibility being associated with mental health, as opposed to helplessness, powerlessness and avoiding responsibility being concommitant with mental illness. All of these encounters have led me to wonder exactly what part power and powerlessness play in shaping our lives, and particularly if mental health/illness can fruitfully be conceptualized using these concepts. Thus, my initial questions were: How does power/powerlessness fit into the understanding of mental health and mental illness? What role do they play in my own life? How can I achieve a better understanding of them which

will facilitate my helping clients and myself to understand and better deal with difficult areas of our lives?

However, before I could begin asking these questions in a disciplined manner, I realized that I really do not understand what power and powerlessness mean, what they are, and what exactly my experience of them is. I feel this vagueness to be compounded as I read the different writers who talk about power and powerlessness. They define the terms differently, use them in different contexts (political, personality theory, economic, etc.), and with different values (power seen as a necessary evil, as The Good, as conflicting with love, as grounding authentic love, etc.). Thus, my first question in addressing these larger issues becomes: What exactly <u>is</u> power and what <u>is</u> powerlessness? We certainly understand something by the terms; we use them often and with facility. Yet, when we try to specify more concretely what we mean by them, the terms elude us to some degree.

It seems especially important to study the structure of these phenomena when we consider that powerlessness is described as accompanying many "neurotic styles" (Shapiro, 1965), often being experienced with feelings of anxiety, depression and despair. In fact, Rollo May states that "a common characteristic of all patients is their powerlessness" (1972, p. 25). Further, powerlessness and power have been considered central to an understanding of personality by psychologists and philosophers such as Adler, Nietzsche, McClelland and Seligman. Despite this, powerlessness has not received the

attention in the psychologist literature that many of the other "negative emotions" have. The vast majority of the literature on power and powerlessness deals almost exclusively with power, and almost without exception the literature either pre-defines or operationally defines the phenomenon. Thus, it seems that power and powerlessness are important potential issues for psychological investigation, and that an investigation which begins to provide a grounded structure of these phenomena would be in order.

It is difficult, however, to provide a structure of power. As will be seen in Chapter II, power's status is somewhat ambiguous. Some consider it a hypothetical construct, others a feeling, others the result of an activity, others a need or trait, and others an experience. Insofar as it is an experience, it should be possible to provide a structure of it. Insofar as it is an entity, a need, a trait, or a construct, the definition and understanding of it will vary. Further, there seem to be different ways of experiencing power. We "have" power; we "are" powerful; we "experience" power. Are these identical or different?

Powerlessness, on the other hand, is a phenomenon which is generally not considered in these several different ways. It is thus much more easily researchable. People generally speak of being or feeling powerless, and it appears to be a common experience - one most people can relate to. Thus, the scope of this study begins to emerge. Its purpose is to provide an initial structure of the experience of powerlessness, and secondly to discuss certain

implications of this structure for re-interpreting the literature and for clinical applications. It is to be hoped that explicating the structure of powerlessness will begin to throw light on the role of power and powerlessness in human experience. However, it should be realized from the outset that one cannot assume that the understanding of powerlessness will automatically provide an understanding of power. While for our purposes we can conceptualize power and powerlessness as endpoints of a bipolar continuum, they may not fit so neatly into our experience of them.

Having defined our question and suggested an initial orientation leading to the asking of it, it remains to provide a methodology which is appropriate to answer it. The methodology should hopefully not do violence to the question itself - stretch the question to fit the methodology - and should provide the sort of answer that the question asks. There are two methodologies, coming from widely different traditions, which attempt to find the structure of phenomena. From the natural scientific tradition of experimental psychology, there is factor analysis. This type of analysis is very powerful for grouping data into statistically meaningful clusters; it can take "bits" of experiences and form them into a structural whole. Alternatively, from the human science tradition of phenomenological psychology, there is the phenomenological reduction and investigation. This type of analysis attempts to find the fundamental description (the way our experience is put together) and the fundamental structure (the existential significance) of the experience in question.

Traditionally, these methodologies have stood in opposition to one another. They often ask different types of questions (e.g., quantitative versus qualitative) in different ways (e.g., experiment versus description) and with widely differing concerns (e.g., validity and reliability versus value, fecundity and metaphor). The type of question this dissertation asks provides a somewhat unique opportunity of wedding these two different approaches and methodologies. The phenomenological approach (as explicated, for instance, by Giorgi, 1970) takes accounts of subjects' experiences and analyzes them to arrive at a fundamental description and structure of the phenomenon in question. The factor analysis takes items and puts them into a structure; where these items come from is undefined. This, then, provides an opportunity for melding the two approaches and methods. We may take accounts of experiences from subjects and first arrive at a phenomenological description and structure of powerlessness. Then we can use these results as the source of items for a factor analytic study, going back again to subjects and getting ratings on items which were obtained from the first investigation. The result, then, is two structures of powerlessness, the phenomenological and the factor analytic. The latter is based partially on the results of the former. The power of both methodologies is thus channeled into the understanding of the phenomenon. Then, the two structures can be compared to see similarities, differences, possible reasons for these, and different utilities they might have.

Thus, the dissertation will be structured as follows: First, in this chapter, the question to be answered is specified, and certain conventions used in the discussions are noted. Chapter II reviews research and literature on the phenomena of power and powerlessness. Following this, Chapter III discusses the phenomenological method for psychological research, and specifies the factor analytic method used in the study. Chapter IV presents the phenomenological analyses and results, while Chapter V gives the factor analytic results. Finally, Chapter VI discusses the conclusions, giving interpretations of each set of results, comparing and combining the two findings, and discussing possible applications.

Two conventions which are employed throughout this paper may be stated at the outset. The term "phenomenological" has now been used several times and is used extensively throughout the paper. "Phenomenological psychology," and "phenomenological research methodology" are not technically correct. Phenomenological psychology, technically, refers to the psychology emanating from the philosophy of Edmund Husserl, and/or other purely phenomenological philosophers. The psychology and research spoken of in this paper are partially grounded in the thought of Husserl, but are more closely identified with the thought of Martin Heidegger and Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Their thinking is properly called existential-phenomenological, and the phenomenological psychology referred to here is more exactly existential-phenomenological psychology.

Paul Colaizzi notes, however, that Husserlian psychology is not as vital a force presently as it once was, and he states that purely phenomenological psychology has reached a dead end (1973, p. 42). While not wanting to make as strong a statement as this, I would observe that the mainstream of works in this field, as evidenced by the Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, the Review of Existential Psychiatry and Psychology, and the publications of the Northwestern and Duquesne University presses seem to lean very heavily towards a psychology which is not purely Husserlian. Thus, following Colaizzi's convention, in this paper I shall refer to existential-phenomenological psychology as "phenomenological psychology," and reserve the term "Husserlian psychology" for the more purely phenomenological psychology.

A second convention refers to the distinction between phenomenological, experimental-experiential and more traditional experimental research paradigms. The phenomenological paradigm (as I will use the term) refers to research which is grounded by existential-phenomenological philosophy and especially as written of by men such as Ernst Keen, Amedeo Giorgi and Paul Colaizzi. Experimental-experiential research will refer to research which is research on experience (e.g., the experience of anger), but which utilizes an experimental method either partially or totally, and frequently is concerned with measuring experience and/or finding lawful relationships between experiences (see in this regard Barrell & Barrell, 1975).

The third form of research I will refer to (interchangeably) as traditional, experimental or natural science psychology/research.

These terms refer to psychology and research methodologies which are grounded in natural scientific approaches, which are primarily quantitative, and most often involve a hypothesis to be tested - defining dependent and independent variables and finding causal or correlative relationships between them. This is the "experimental method," and I use the three separate terms for readability.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Before commencing our investigation into the structure of powerlessness, it seems reasonable to examine what other work - both theoretical and research - has been done on powerlessness. This examination can provide a context for the present research - a ground of previous thought and research findings upon which this investigation can build. In order to establish this context, it is necessary for several reasons to go beyond examining the concept of powerlessness. First, the concept of powerlessness has not been extensively researched or written about (with notable exceptions such as Seligman, 1975, Tillich, 1954, and May, 1972). Secondly, among many writers who speak of powerlessness, it is seen as the other end of a bi-polar continuum with power. Thus, to examine these writers' views of powerlessness, it would be necessary to examine their thinking about power. (It is not being implied that powerlessness is not the other end of such a continuum, but merely that judgement on this should be reserved in order to look more freely at the experience of powerlessness per se.) Thirdly, as one secondary goal of this study is to provide a basis for later questions concerning power and powerlessness, a literature review including power is desirable.

Thus, the goals of this chapter include: the examination of research and theories (psychological and philosophical) of the nature

of power and powerlessness; a review of both the definitions of these terms and the research implications of understanding them; and an investigation of the differing contexts from within which these two concepts are understood and studied. In reading on the psychology and philosophy of power, for instance, one soon finds certain authors seeing power as inherently corrupting man, while others see it as necessary for healthy functioning. Some see it as an activity, others as a need, others yet as intention. Hopefully, this review can begin to clarify the differing perspectives and contexts from which these viewpoints spring. Further, it sets the stage for a structure of powerlessness from which these present definitions and contexts can be understood as differing perspectives of the same central phenomenon.

It would be very difficult (and most probably tedious reading) to provide a comprehensive literature review of power and powerlessness. Historical figures concerned with power include Plato, Machiavelli, Erasmus and Hobbes (Winter, 1973, p. 2), and an all-inclusive review would constitute a rather large tome in itself. Thus, I have chosen to review all the literature on powerlessness (as it is not extensive), selected psychological theorists of power, and certain of the more current psychological, sociological, and/or philosophical thought on power.

Organizing such a literature review poses certain initial problems. The literature is divided into literature on power, literature on powerlessness, and literature on power which has implications for powerlessness. In each of these categories, there are philosophical (theoretical) writings, and psychological (research) writings. Further, each of

the philosophical and psychological categories can be broken down into the existential or phenomenological writings, on the one hand, and the experimental (psychological) or analytic/empirical (philosophical) writings on the other. Finally, the literature on power approaches the concept from the perspectives of power as a need, political, social or economic power, power as a personality construct, etc. Thus, there is a possibility of organizing the review either by author (which often would imply a crossing of these themes) or by theme/category (in which case the reader might lose the continuity of a given author's thought).

To best achieve the purposes of this literature review - to examine the definitions of powerlessness and the different perspectives on it, the literature review will be organized as follows: First, an examination of the existential writings on power and powerlessness are presented. Second, experimental psychology writings on powerlessness are reviewed. Finally, traditional philosophical and psychological writings on power are investigated. These writings are further broken down into: the philosophy of power, the psychology of power, power as a personality construct, the need-power, and social, political and economic power.

Existential Analyses of Power

The primary existentially oriented philosopher of power is, of course, Friedrich Nietzsche. In addition to his analyses, other existential thinkers such as Rollo May and Paul Tillich have described power and its role in human life. Themes of power and powerlessness are also apparent in the writings of Binswanger and Heidegger in a less developed fashion; these latter will not be dealt with here.

Nietzsche

Nietzsche's analysis of power - the "will to power" - is apparent in his Thus Spoke Zarathustra. It is more completely developed in the compilation of notes which constitutes his book The Will to Power. The Will to Power is subtitled, Attempt at a Revaluation of Values. This portrays both Nietzsche's project and his understanding of the will to power. Basically, the will to power is an existential statement of "I choose" in the face of external sources of value (e.g., Christianity) which are breaking down in society at large (nihilism). Specifically, Nietzsche analyzes the nihilism of Western man as a breakdown in the values that we have had for at least 2,000 years. Some of these values were the Christian ones. In mass society, as Nietzsche interprets it, man throws himself over to an external source of values - the priest, the church, the values that he is taught he must or should accept. It is these values that are breaking down with the loss of belief in Christianity

in general in the nineteenth (and twentieth) centuries. As well, the advent of natural sciences, the current political and economic systems are sources for the breakdown of traditionally held values. What remains is a nihilistic state in which man drifts without any sense of rootedness.

Themes of decadence, weakness, exhaustion and the herd mentality enter here. Exhaustion is a loss of the power to resist the imposition of values upon the individual. This exhaustion is brought about in part by decadence. Nietzsche specifies particular types of decadence prevelent today:

> Believing one chooses remedies, one chooses in fact that which hastens exhaustion; Christianity is an example . . . one loses one's power of resistance against stimuli (e.g., de-personalization, coming to be at the mercy of accidents). . . . One confuses cause and effect: one fails to understand decadence as a physiological condition and mistakes its consequences for the real cause of the indisposition; example: all of religious morality. . . . One longs for a condition in which one no longer suffers; life is actually experienced as the ground of ills. (1967, p. 27)

Within this context of nihilism and decadence, the "Ubermensch" or "Superman" is able to assert his will, to choose the values to which he aspires and disregard societal constraints. This will to power is interpreted by Nietzsche as a will to knowledge, as an openness to life, and in terms of the society and the individual. Paul Tillich says of Nietzsche that:

> The will to power means neither will nor power, if taken in the ordinary sense of the words. He does not speak of the psychological function called will, although the will to power may become manifest in conscious acts of man, e.g., in the self-control exercised by the commanding will. But basically the will to power in Nietzsche is,

> as it was in Schopenhauer, a designation of the dynamic self-affirmation of life . . . [it is] the drive of everything living to realize itself with increasing intensity and extensity. The will to power is not the will of men to attain power over men, but it is the self-affirmation of life in its self-transcending dynamics, overcoming internal and external resistance. (1954, pp. 36-37)

May agrees, stating that Nietzsche meant "neither 'will' nor 'power' in the competitive sense of the modern day, but rather self-realization and self-actualization" (1972, p. 20). I am not convinced that Nietzsche is univocally stating that the will to power is not the attempt to attain power over other men; it seems that (at least for me) there are many rather ambiguous strains within The Will to Power. However, this should not take away from the point which Nietzsche makes about power, which sees it in terms of personal choice and self-affirmation.

Tillich

Whereas Nietzsche's primary concern is for a revaluation of values, Paul Tillich, in Love, Power and Justice (1954) is primarily concerned with ontology - with "describing the texture of being as being" (p. 35). He asks, "Can one say anything more elaborate of being than to elaborate the categories and polarities which constitute its texture" (p. 35)? His answer is both yes and no. No, being can not be defined - it is the most fundamental term inherent in any definition, and no definition can go beneath it. However, he also answers yes in the sense that being can be pointed to metaphorically. Power is the metaphor which Tillich uses to fundamentally describe being: "Being is the power of being over non-being" (p. 37).

Tillich states that all beings affirm their being over against their non-being. He says, "This self affirmation of a being in spite of non-being is the expression of the power of being. . . . Power is the possibility of self-affirmation in spite of internal and external negation" (p. 40). The power of being becomes manifest in the process of actualizing this power - specifically in the encounter with other beings with similar self-affirmational tendencies. In this encounter one may, for instance, draw another's power in and assimilate it, throw off another's attempt to assimilate one's own power, or surrender to the power of being of the other (p. 42).

Power, for Tillich, is intimately related to other phenomena, such as force and compulsion. Power "uses and abuses compulsion to overcome the threat of non-being. . . . It uses and abuses force to actualize itself" (p. 47). Although it seemingly contradicts the tie between power and force, Tillich also understands power as being in unity with love. Love, seen as the reunion of the separated, is manifested through the power of being in the interaction of two beings. Tillich sums up his analysis of power as follows:

> Power of the self is its self centerdness. Self control is the preservation of this centerdness against disruptive tendencies, coming from the elements which constitute the center. . . . Power over oneself is the power of the self over the forces which constitute it and each of which tries to determine it. (p. 52)
>
> This power is an independent power but . . . its power is the power of a stabilized balance of the elements which are centered in it. (p. 53)

May

In his book, Power and Innocence, Rollo May offers incisive analyses of the nature of both power and powerlessness. His basic project (like Nietzsche's) is contained in the subtitle of his book: A search for the Sources of Violence. Whereas Nietzsche is primarily a philosopher, and Tillich a theologian, May is a psychologist with psychological concerns. In this book, he attempts to analyze the fundamental nature of power and powerlessness in an attempt to understand the causes of violence in society. He states that "the state of powerlessness, which leads to apathy and which can be produced by . . . [societal] plans for the uprooting of aggression, is the source of violence. . . . Violence arises not of superfluity of power but out of powerlessness" (p. 23).

The progression of powerlessness to violence proceeds along five stages, corresponding to what May terms five "levels of power." The first is the power to be: May asserts that even an infant needs to be - to cry, to live, to get a response to his actions from his environment. The second level is the need for self-affirmation. This is the cry for recognition, the quest for self-esteem, which is especially significant for the human organism, as May notes, as it is gifted with self-consciousness. When this self-affirmation meets resistance, we "make greater effort, we give power to our stance, making clear what we are and what we believe; we state it now against opposition" (p. 41). This is the third phase, or self-assertion. If this third phase is frustrated, the person moves into the fourth phase of power - aggression. Aggression is "moving into the positions of power or prestige or the territory of another and taking possession

of some of it for one's self" (p. 42). Finally, when all aggression proves ineffective, there is "the ultimate explosion known as 'violence'" (p.43). This violence is largely physical because all other alternatives have been blocked off.

Thus, powerlessness is linked for May with self-affirmation, with being "okay" in some sense, although the grounds of this link are not clear. May continues with an analysis of power. Power is "the ability to cause or prevent change" (p. 99), and has two forms, latent power (the possibility) or actuality. As such, May agrees with Nietzsche that power is an expression of the life process; however, he notes that there is a danger of identifying power with the life process which may leave out other processes as self-consciousness, curiosity and desire (p. 100). There are five types of power which May analyzes: Exploitive power (one uses another solely and nakedly for his own ends); manipulative power (power <u>over</u> another, but not as nakedly applied); competitive power (power <u>against</u> the other); nutrient power (power <u>for</u> the other - e.g., a mother's love); and integrative power (power <u>with</u> the other - where "my power abets yours"). In the higher states, power and love merge to some degree. May sees a distinction between the terms (e.g., "power" includes the lower level powers which have little to do with love), however, he states that at the higher levels of power, the relationship is characterized by love.

These three existential analyses of power and powerlessness share many common elements. Each sees power as in some sense a "self affirmation," a dynamic affirmation of the self in its selfhood

and as a life process. As such, they see power as something which is "good," which is to be sought after rather than rejected. The opposite of this idea would be that of Charles Reich, when he states that "It's not the misuse of power that is an evil; the very existence of power is an evil" (quoted in May, 1972, p. 56). The three authors would agree that the non-existence of power would be an impossibility, as power is inherently bound up in the dynamic process of human life living itself.

It is interesting to note that this similar theme is seen in spite of the three dissimilar orientations of the writers (theology, philosophy and psychology) with their three different purposes in writing about power (inquiring into ontology, values and social violence). Further, Tillich and May also see a strong connection between power and love.

The one caveat that should be noted in the above analyses is their "fait accompli" nature. In each case, the nature and significance of power was presented with no supporting analysis, as a given fact. In each case, the structures of power - the structure relating power to love, to self-affirmation, to life's dynamic self expression - remain unexplicated. In presenting a phenomenology of powerlessness, similarities and dissimilarities with these previous existential analyses can be noted, along with the grounding phenomenological analysis which supports the essence of powerlessness.

Traditional Studies of Powerlessness

There has been no extensive research or theorizing about the concept of powerlessness. What there is, for the most part, is contained explicitly or implicitly in the words of authors primarily interested in power, who see powerlessness as its compliment. In the next section on power, these themes will be explicated to some degree. There are two primary thrusts which explore concepts which seem at least initially very related to powerlessness. These are, first, the work on learned helplessness by Martin Seligman and his colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania, and second, work by various sociologists on the concept of alienation understood as powerlessness.

Learned Helplessness

In his (1975) book, Helplessness (On Depression, Development and Death), Seligman explicates the idea of helplessness from within a comparative, experimental analysis of behavior framework. He arrives at a theory of helplessness and its effects on learning, emotionality and motivation which he applies both to lower order animals and human beings in a very interesting and provocative way. According to Seligman, "A person or animal is helpless with respect to some outcome when the outcome occurs independently of all his voluntary responses" (p. 17). Voluntary responses are only those

responses which can be modified by reward and punishment (p. 11); response-outcome independence occurs when the probability of a given outcome is identical whether or not a response occurs (p. 16). Thus, Seligman has rather elegantly defined helplessness in operational terms. This "learned helplessness" seems to be a close and related phenomenon to that of powerlessness, as one might initially understand it. Thus, reviewing the work on learned helplessness may cast some additional light on our investigation of powerlessness.

Seligman summarizes his experiments on helplessness as follows: "Laboratory experiments on helplessness produce three deficits: They undermine the motivation to respond, they retard the ability to learn that responding works and they result in emotional disturbances, primarily depression and anxiety" (p. 6). The typical experiment to which Seligman refers occurs when an animal (say a dog) is subjected to a series of shocks which (from his point of view) are uncontrollable, while he is under restraint. These shocks are not preceded by any signal and are delivered on a random time sequence. Later, these dogs (and control animals) are given a signalled escape-avoidance task: They are placed in a shuttle box and after the onset of a signal, they are required to jump a barrier to terminate the shock. One third of shocked animals learn this task efficiently. The other two-thirds exhibit what Seligman terms a "striking giving-up sequence," involving remaining motionless, huddling up and whining (pp. 22-25).

Seligman goes into detail on his three deficits. He states that with both rats and college sophomores (two very common subject pools

for psychologists) "uncontrollable events undermine the motivation to initiate voluntary responses that control other events" (p. 37). This is demonstrated in the experimental paradigm cited above: The dogs no longer initiate voluntary response, but rather huddle and freeze at shock onset. Second, helplessness "disrupts the ability to learn" (p. 37). Without detailing the paradigm used to differentiate response initiation from learning, Seligman also shows that it takes "helpless" animals longer to learn new tasks than naive animals. Seligman states that the two formal theories of the relationship between learned helplessness and depression and anxiety are as follows:

> I suggest that what produces self-esteem and a sense of competance, and protects against depression, is not only the absolute quality of experience, but the perception that one's own actions controlled the experience. To the degree that uncontrollable events occur, either traumatic or positive, depression will be pre-disposed and ego strength undermined. To the degree that controllable events occur, a sense of mastery and resistance to depression will result. (p. 99)

> When aversive events are un-predictable, no safety signal exists and anxiety ensues. Monitoring of anxiety during predictable and unpredictable shock confirms the safety signal hypothesis. . . . Animals and men choose predictable over unpredictable shock, as expected from the safety-signal hypothesis. While controllable events are predictable by the feedback from the response that controls them, controllability may have anxiety-reducing consequences in addition to this predictability - perceived potential control and nonveridical control of aversive events also relieve anxiety. (p. 132)

Seligman also analyzes methods for curing learned helplessness (and also by implication directions for the relief of depression and anxiety). One of these methods involves forcing a response from the animal. In the paradigm above, it would imply forcing the dog

over the barrier repeatedly until he learns that his responses do control the event outcomes. He also theorizes about possible developmental patterns that result in helplessness as a "personality trait." These involve parenting behaviors (as one might expect) which leave the child uncertain about his own actions and the consequences they have - again setting up the response-outcome unpredictability which characterizes helplessness. In the worst situations, the belief that one can do nothing to influence the event outcomes can produce death, in both animals and men. Seligman has done work with rats placed in a vat to swim until they die. Wild rats which have been held in the experimenter's hand repeatedly (i.e., made helpless) will drown within minutes, while other control rats will swim for upwards of 30 hours in the vat before succumbing. While similar work for ethical reasons is not possible with college sophomores, Seligman refers to different accounts by prison camp doctors of deaths which seem to have psychological origins.

Seligman summarizing this theory of helplessness as follows:

> The expectation that an outcome is independent of responding (1) reduces the motivation to control the outcome; (2) interferes with learning that responding controls the outcome; and, if the outcome is traumatic, (3) produces fear for as long as the subject is uncertain of the uncontrollability of the outcome, and then produces depression. (p. 56)

The theory is very provocative and suggests much further research and possible clinical application. While Seligman is primarily a comparative psychologist, in his book he takes care to relate each issue to human beings, and where possible, he provides research. One possible area in which the thoery raises questions is precisely

in the area of its greatest strength - the operational (external) definition of helplessness. Seen externally, we are helpless with respect to many phenomena - the sun rising, heat coming on and off in buildings in which we work, etc. We do not generalize helpless symptomatology from these situations to others, as Seligman suggests helplessness generalizes. Perhaps the reason has to do with the intentional state of the person - we have no desire to control the sun rise, nor any expectation that we should have such a desire. However, to get into intention vitiates exactly the area of strength from which Seligman's theory arises - the operational, external definition of the phenomenon.

Alienation

In his (1959) article, "On the meaning of alienation," Melvin Seeman provides a comprehensive review of the different ways that the term alienation has been used in the field of sociology. He distinguishes five different understandings of the term: alienation as meaninglessness; alienation as normlessness; alienation as self-estrangement; alienation as isolation; and alienation of powerlessness. The last of these is of primary concern for us in this review; understanding that alienation seen as powerlessness is taken in this sense from the social-psychological point of view.

Alienation understood as powerlessness is conceived as "the expectancy of probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcement, he seeks" (p. 784). The applicability of the concept is limited to

"expectancies that have to do with the individual's sense of influence over the socio-political system" (p. 785). Historically, Seeman notes that this varient of alienation originated in the "Marxian view of the worker's condition in capitalist society: the worker is alienated to the extent that the prerogative and means of decision are expropriated by the ruling entrepreneurs" (p. 784). The economic emphasis of Marx was extended by Weber's work. He saw the worker's separation from the means of production as only one special case in a general trend. Seeman quotes, "The modern soldier is equally 'separated' from the means of violence; the scientist from the means of enquiry, and the civil servant from the means of administration" (p. 794). Of current sociological thinkers, Seeman notes that C. Wright Mills and J. Gouldner conceive of alienation in this sense of powerlessness.

This view of powerlessness understands it as a function of the individual's expectancy. This is to be distinguished from the objective nature of the situation, as well as the individual's moral value judgement of the situation. Alienation interpreted as powerlessness is also to be distinguished, according to Seeman, from more strictly psychological notions; specifically, the internal versus external control of reinforcements developed by Rotter. Seeman says, "The congruence in these formulations leaves the way open for the development of a closer bond between two languages of analysis - that of learning theory and that of alienation - that have long histories in psychology and sociology. But the conguence also poses a problem - the problem of recognizing that these two constructs, though intimately

related, are not generally used to understand the same things" (p. 785).

The internal/external control of Rotter will be discussed in more depth in the next section. For now, we can learn that in addition to the psychological and philosophical concerns with power and powerlessness, there is also at least one current of thought within the discipline of sociology which also attempts to understand powerlessness. It sees powerlessness, again, as intimately involved with the individual's inability to determine the occurrence of outcomes which he seeks - this time, specifically, outcomes in the socio-political-economic realm.

Traditional Studies of Power

The phenomenon of power has been of interest to many philosophers and psychologists, coming from very different traditions. In line with our attempt to delineate the different viewpoints from which power is studied, this section will again separate theorists and researchers of power by the context within which they work. These will include Russell's philosophy of power, the psychology of power, power as a personality construct, the need-Power, and power in politics and economics.

Russell's Philosophy of Power

Bertrand Russell's (1938) book, Power, A New Social Analysis, is known and referred to by most of the other authors reviewed in this chapter, be they philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, etc. His central thesis is that power is the fundamental conception in social sciences, holding the equivalent place to energy in physics (p. 10). He supports this view with an extensive and in depth analysis of the phenomenon of power.

Russell begins grounding his perspective on power with his view of man. Animals, Russell states, have needs which are then satisfied. For instance, they are hungry, then they eat, become satiated, and rest. Unlike animals, men have certain "infinite desires," remaining active even when these needs are met. Russell says, "Imagination is

the goad that forces human beings into restless exertion after their primary needs have been satisfied." The desires for power and glory are the two chief infinite desires. These are not identical, although many actions manifest both (and thus for many practical purposes, they may be considered equivalent).

Power is defined by Russell as the production of intended effects (p. 35). It has many different sub-divisions: There is new power versus traditional power; power over things versus power over humans; and individual versus organizational power. Additionally, power takes many forms - wealth, arms, influence - many of which are interchangeable (pp. 10-11). People experience a love of, or need for, power. Russell defines this as follows: "Love of power, in its widest sense, is the desire to be able to produce intended effects upon the outer world, whether human or non-human. . ." (p. 274). This love of power is unevenly distributed among people as a motive, and it is tempered by other motives which people have (p. 15). There are two forms of this power impulse, the explicit and implicit. The explicit form of the power impulse is that of the leader - he acquires the ability to do what he likes, produce the effect he wishes. The other form is that of the follower - the implicit form. "When men willingly follow a leader, they do so with a view to the acquisition of power by the group which he commands, and they feel that his triumphs are theirs" (p. 15). These two forms of power are seen as matters of a man's character by Russell: It is some men's character to command, and others' to obey (p. 16). He also states that while the explicit impulse to power has its roots in the primary need for

power and glory, the impulse to submission, "which is just as real and just as common as the impulse to command, has its roots in fear" (p. 18).

Having expressed his initial conception of power, Russell goes on to examine certain types of power in detail: Priestly power; kingly power; naked power; revolutionary power; economic power; etc. He then examines the social implications of power. These implications stem from, first, the definition of power as the production of one's own intended effects, and second, the distinction between traditional and new power. Power, if used without regard for the other person, does not take into account his interests and needs, and thus there is a need for tradition and custom to safeguard against the mis-use of power. Russell states:

> [Naked power] involves no aquiescience on the part of the subject. . . If human life is to be, for the mass of mankind, anything better than a dull misery punctuated with moments of sharp horror, there must be as little naked power as possible. The exercise of power, if it is to be something better than the infliction of wanton torture, must be hedged round by safeguards of law and custom. (pp. 106-107)

Thus Russell states the role of power in society. It is a force which can be used for good or evil. In its naked form - the power of an individual to do what he lists without any law or custom to bind him - the possibility of the mere "infliction of wanton torture" seems very present for Russell. Thus, the mass of mankind's opinion underlies other powers, but physical force of its threat underlies opinions (p. 140).

Russell carries this into an ethical analysis. "Power may be an end, but in the most sustaining systems it has been the means."

That is, again, the raw exercise of power does not meet the needs of other beings, and thus no viable system is sustained by it. "The love of power, if beneficent, must be a means, and therefore this ultimate purpose must be beneficent" (p. 276). "The ultimate aim of those who have power . . . should be to promote social cooperation . . . in the whole human race" (p. 283).

There is thus a contradiction between Russell's view of power and those of, say, Nietzsche or Tillich. In fact, Russell states, "The Ubermensch can harm the herd for his own self development. . . . Power philosophers are insane because they neglect the fact that other beings are and need consideration" (pp. 269-270). In Russell's view the philosophies of, for instance, Nietzsche or Fichte, lead to the states of war and/or police states, and conflicts of will are settled by violence. Thus, this view (in direct opposition to that of Tillich) would state that it is unrestrained power (rather than its lack) which leads to violence.

Perhaps this conflict goes further than the nature of power into the nature of man which each of these philosophers pre-supposes. For Russell, the chief obstacle in the way of social cooperation is the desire for superiority held by many who have a high love of power (pp. 283-284). Man is thus seen as a being who, if unrestrained and able to impose his will upon others, would do so against their benefit.

Psychology of Power

The primary theorist of the psychology of power is, of course, Alfred Adler. Adler can be considered a "power psychologist" since

for him power is the essential and primary construct. In addition to the work of Adler, this section reviews the psychology of power of Ronald Sampson, a neo-Freudian thinker.

Where for Freud, the broadly defined sexual (libinal) urge was the motivator for human behavior, for Adler this is translated as a drive for power. He states, "The goal of superiority, of power, of the conquest of others, is the goal which directs the activity of most human beings" (1927, p. 33). Power is thus associated with superiority, with conquest, with the imposition of one's will over against the countervailing will of the other. Adler refers to it as "the poison of the craving for power," seeing it as something to be avoided rather than embraced, as evil rather than good. In this, Russell's and Adler's analyses agree.

This love, this craving for power is not something innate in the organism, according to Adler. He states:

> Modern psychology has shown us that the traits of craving for power, ambition and striving for power over others, with their numerous ugly concomitants, are not innate and unalterable. Rather, they are inoculated into the child at an early age; the child receives them involuntarily from an atmosphere saturated by the titillation of power. In our blood is still the desire for the intoxication with power, and our souls are playthings of the craving for power. (1966, p. 170)

How does this craving for power develop in the child? In addition to the "titillating atmosphere" of power, there exists an inherent inferiority of the child with respect to his parents. Adler says that the child realizes early that others satisfy their urges more completely than he and are thus better prepared to live. "His

instincts are baffled in their fulfillment by obstacles whose conquest gives him pain" (1927, p. 39).

> A desire to grow, to become as strong or stronger than all others, arises in his soul. To dominate those who are gathered about him becomes his chief purpose in life. (1927, pp. 39-40)

> It is the feeling of inferiority, inadequacy, insecurity, which determines the goal of an individual's existence. The tendency to push into the limelight, to compel the attention of parents, makes itself felt in the first days of life. Here are found the first indications of the awakening desire for recognition developing itself under the concomitant influence of the sense of inferiority, with its purpose of attainment of a goal in which the individual is seemingly superior to his environment. (1927, p. 67)

The child has two strategies open to him. He may imitate his elders in their strengths, and so attain them, or he may continue in his weakness - placing demands upon them to take care of him. Adler's view of the social consequences of this striving for power are similar to those of Russell. He states:

> The waves of the power striving of society break into the comfort of the nursery. The parent's desires to dominate, servant arrangements in the house, privileges accorded to the infant, irresistibly drive the mind of the child toward the achievement of power and predominance, and allow only this position to appear tempting. Not until somewhat later do social feelings enter his soul, usually to fall under the domination of the already developed desire for power. . . The result of individual and social psychological inquiry is therefore: the striving for power is a disastrous delusion and poisons man's living together. Whoever desires the human community must renounce the striving for power over others. (1966, p. 169)

Again, we can get an impression of Adler's view of man in the unrestrained condition. For Adler, the infant will have a craving for power and superiority whether or not his needs are met. If so, he will see that only by his superiority can he get his needs met. If not, he

can see that he must attain this superiority in order to get what he wants. The social context of which Adler writes seems to be a somewhat oppressively upper class one: the houses have servants; other people are not eating (or eating as well), and thus one has delicacies. In this context, the satisfaction of ones desires goes against community interests - as I get more of what I want or need, someone else goes without. The desires are ones for food, for material possessions, for control over the activities of other persons.

Sampson, like Adler, sees power as a central concept in the understanding of human motivation and behavior. Also similarly to Adler, Sampson has a distrust of power, seeing it as antithetical to love. He says, "Man may seek to order his life and his relationships with others on the basis of love or on the basis of power. The two forces are antithetical, but are directly related to one another. To the extent we develop our capacity for power we weaken our capacity for love, and conversely" (1965, p. 8).

Sampson sees two possibilities for the ubiquitous presence of power in human interrelations. The first is that "we are so biologically constituted that the appetite for domination and power to obtain privileges for oneself and one's group at the expense of those with whom one is competing, is endemic and ineradicable to human nature" (pp. 9-10). This assumption leads to two alternative conclusions. The first is either that "the world is purposeless," or second, that "there is not one human nature but two: leader and

follower" (p. 10). The alternative hypothesis is that there exists a common human nature and the struggle for inequality is not endemic to it. Then the problem is to explain how things go wrong in society to produce the common power struggles.

Sampson decides on the latter hypothesis and, after an extensive analysis of power, concludes that:

> Each man has an inner self which exists, however weakly, and tried to be heard and influence conduct. Failure occurs because of the external pressures which make it impossible for the individual to act up to the demands of the ideal self without arousing acute fears or putting beyond reach keenly desired pleasures. . . . The resolution of the conflict is a false one; and therefore unconsciously it continues the more fiercely for being repressed. . . . Ultimately, the individual pays a very high price indeed for his temporizing and his fear and his need to dominate. (pp. 138-139)

Power as a Personality Construct

This category may initially seem somewhat broad - a category which could encompass all of the work done by psychologists on power. I have separated it out for two reasons: First, it follows the comprehensive review supplied by Henry Minton (1967); second, the work under this rubric is characterized by a certain theme - certain goals and pre-suppositions which are not completely identical to the other writings. Minton states, "The present paper will survey theoretical approaches and consequent attempts at measuring and manipulating the dimension of latent power" (p. 231). Thus, these approaches are characterized by the attempts to measure power, to consider it on a dimension of individual differences, and would implicitly be concerned with notions such as construct validity. (The following section on

the need-Power also is characterized by these concerns; I am, however, giving it a separate section because of its extensiveness and direct application to this work.)

Minton defines power as the "ability to cause environmental change so as to obtain an intended effect" (p. 229). This definition, he notes, is in close agreement with Heider's, as well as Russell's understanding of power (above). Along with other writers, Minton distinguishes between what he terms "manifest" and "latent" power. "The production and implementation of power as exemplified by effectiveness, influence, power strategies, and attempts to gain or use power are at the level of manifest power, whereas expressed feelings of individual power and readiness to apply manifest power represent latent power" (pp. 229-230). Of the two, Minton's review covers the latter more extensively. Whereas power is the ability to cause environmental change, latent power is "an example of what Cambell refers to as an 'acquired behavioral disposition'" (p. 230). Latent power, then, is "a disposition that has been acquired through past experiences in instrumental situations and that functions as a coordinator of behavior in such situations. As a disposition, it can further be conceived as varying along a dimension of powerlessness-powerfulness" (p. 230). As such, Minton believes that power is related to other psychological concepts such as autonomy, competence, psychological causality, and field dependence-independence (pp. 230-231).

In reviewing the early theorists who utilized the concept of power, Minton mentions Adler, and adds the names of Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, Otto Rank and Kurt Lewin. After briefly describing the role of power in the psychology of each of them, he

proceeds to the three main theorists of power as a personality construct: Fritz Heider, John Thibaut and Harold Kelley, and Julian Rotter.

According to Heider, "power as an attitude is reflected by the attribution of can." "An attitude of powerfulness or high power is consistent with an action outcome ascribed to the person; an attitude of powerlessness or low power is consistent with success ascribed to the environment" (Minton, 1967, p. 232). Heider's investigation then centers around factors or conditions which participate in the determination of attribution. For instance, task difficulty is a factor which affects the attribution of cause. If the task is easy, causal attribution for successful outcome is assigned to the task. If the task is hard, a successful outcome is attributed to the person. Other factors influencing attribution are environmental factors of luck and opportunity, personal characteristics such as fatigue and mood, and other factors such as social/legal status, possessions, needs, opinions, and suggestion. The power attitude, concludes Minton of Heider, "Is dimensionalized on a continuum extending from an environmental or external source to a personal or internal source of action" (p. 234).

Like Heider, Thibaut and Kelley conceive of power as a product of the person/environment interaction. Their unique contribution comes in the relationship they posit between power and "comparison level" (CL). The CL is "a neutral point on a scale of outcomes. Any event or relationship that produces outcomes above the CL is a source of gratification to the individual; any event or relationship that

produces outcomes below the CL is a source of dissatisfaction" (p. 235). The CL thus represents an individual's generalized expectation of outcomes. The high CL person tends to emphasize rewards and not costs, and is "characterized by attitudes of powerfulness and optimism" (p. 235), and thus seems coincident with latent power.

Thibaut and Kelley's work parallels Heider's in several respects: The high CL person will attribute more causality to himself, whereas the low CL (low power) person attributes causality more to the environment.

From his social learning theory, Rotter has developed the concept of internal versus external control of reinforcement which again seems to parallel the concept of latent power. Internal versus external control reflects an individual difference in the attribution of one's causality in ambiguous situations. In other words, in situations which are less structured (and have fewer perviously defined sources of causality), an internally controlled individual will tend to attribute causality to himself, whereas an external individual will attribute it more to the environment. This is a "generalized expectation of one's causal relationship with events" (p. 237) which is modified by other factors, such as previous expectations, level of task complexity, etc., as with Heider.

In an in depth review of experimental evidence supporting the existence of this dimension, Minton discusses several experiments by Rotter and his colleagues. One of the primary contributions that Rotter has made with this work is his creation of a scale to measure

internal versus external locus of control - the "I/E Scale." The I/E scale consists of 29 forced choice items which are concerned with the subject's expectancies (rather than behavioral preferences), with controls for social desireability and low item validity (p. 240). Validity and reliability for the I/E scale appear good, according to Minton, and it has been correlated with the Personality Research Form (negatively) and different measures of need-Achievement (negatively). Additionally, the I/E scale has been positively correlated with measures of Machiavelianism and anxiety (pp. 241-242). The concept of internal versus external locus of control has also led Rotter to several hypotheses including ones that there should exist a positive relationship between internal control and need-Achievement, and that internals should be "more resistive to subtle attempts that are not to their benefit" (p. 246). In all, Minton describes the I/E scale as one workable, operational scaling of the dimension of power and powerlessness.

Minton concludes his review by noting the similarities between the works of Heider, Thibaut and Kelley and Rotter. Latent power, he notes, is seen by each of these men as both "a situational and dispositional variable" (p. 253). While agreement is present, Minton finds Rotter's schema heuristically most valuable, as it provides both a differential scale and an experimental framework. He suggests that these theories have much in common with Adlerian psychology, in the sense that they all point to "a continuing struggle by the individual to control or master his environment" (p. 253), but notes that conceptualizing power as a drive seems too simplistic. In these newer

conceptions of power as an expectancy, disposition or attitude, power is shown to operate in a more complex manner in its determinants and as a predictor (p. 260). While noting that there has been a general neglect of the dimension of power and powerlessness in the field (p. 253), and that there are many major issues which require much clarification (i.e., the interaction of situational and dispositional determinants in producing latent power), Minton suggests that the study of power may have implications for the study of psycho-pathology and behavior modification. He further suggests that power be examined in order better to understand social change generally, and concludes that one possible function of the concept of power is as "an integrative principle within psychology and for social sciences as a whole" (p. 262).

Need-Power

In this review of current literature dealing with power and powerlessness, one may notice a trend: There is a shift in emphasis from the activity of power/powerlessness, or the experience of power/powerlessness, to a drive, a striving, a will, a love, or a disposition to power. It is the disposition or the person's tendency which is then studied in depth, rather than the experience itself. (This is not to imply that this is a wrong direction, but merely that the literature is gradually veering away from our topic here.) One implication of this tendency is that powerlessness, perforce, becomes the absence of power. A will or striving for power makes sense; a striving for powerlessness does not. Powerlessness becomes a condition

in which one has no latent power, or perhaps a condition resulting from the absence of the love or striving for power. This tendency in the study of power and powerlessness are seen in the research on the need for power (n-Power) by David McClelland and David Winter.

In his book, The Power Motive, Winter identifies the themes of research on n-Power as the "identification and measurement of the striving for power as one important motive or disposition in individuals" (p. 1). Power, for Winter, is defined as "the ability or capacity of [one individual] to produce (consciously or unconsciously) intended effects on the behavior or emotions of another person" (p. 5). Thus, the definition concerns actions that are social in character - that effect another person rather than things; it deals with actions and effects which are intentional rather than accidental; and it concerns both the capacity for the production of effects and their actual production. Winter and McClelland both see n-Power as a motive - as a need in Murray's sense. As such, it is comparable with the need for achievement, affiliation, etc. It is an interactional effect between the person's character and the situation, rather than being a property of either. That is, the situation can call forth a powerful/powerless response, but it interacts with the individual's own pre-disposition to give that response (pp. 16-17).

The need for power is seen as a motive. Motives have certain characteristics for Winter, including: (1) It is goal directed; (2) behavior is more and more predictable as the goal is approached, thereafter it is unpredictable with respect to that goal; (3) as the

person approaches the goal, he becomes less and less distractable from that goal; and (4) the behavior shows intelligent variations with the situation in order to achieve that goal (p. 29).

Thus, the striving for power is seen as a motivating force which influences the direction of behaviors to achieve a sense of ability or capacity in the person to be able to influence others. The next problem is one of measurement: How can one measure the amount of striving for power that different people have? To measure this motive, Winter and McClelland go back to the thought of Murray. Murray believed that people apperceive objects: They observe them and assign meaning to them in that perception. This meaning-filled perception is the apperception. Murray developed the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) to give ambiguous stimuli to clients upon which they could then apperceive - project their own meanings (which would then be interpreted by the clinician). Different scoring strategies for the n-Power, based on TAT cards, are discussed by Winter. Among them are the methods of Veroff, Uleman, Winter and McClelland. One of the earlier methods by Veroff utilized contrasted groups - students seeking college office were assumed to be high in n-Power and compared with another group similarly low in n-Power. The McClelland-Atkinson methodology, which both Winter and McClelland use, is based on the experimental induction of high n-Power in subjects (pp. 30 ff). After examining this methodology in detail, Winter discusses the scoring keys, the selection of scorers, the selection of themes which were looked for in the scoring of TAT protocols, etc. McClelland describes part of the process as follows:

> It turns out that the best and simplest way of finding out what is going on in a person's head is to ask him to tell brief imaginative stories to pictures. Under these conditions, he does not know what you are asking . . . and thus the stories he tells are unlikely to be influenced by such extraneous variables as the norm of what is socially desireable. . . . The key decision then for the investigator to make is how to arouse the power motive. Here he falls back on common sense, he locates conditions that ought to arouse power motives. . . . Students were asked by Veroff (1957) to write imaginative stories while they were waiting to see if they had been elected to office; by Uleman after they had served in the powerful role of experimenter, or after they had watched a convincing demonstration of hypnosis. . . . When Winter sifted through the fantasy effects of all these arousal experiments, he gradually evolved a method of subjectively defining and coding power themes that captured the essence of the fantasy changes in the simplest, most objective and coherent manner. . . . One starts with power-arousing experiences; they produce effects in fantasy which are many and scattered. Out of them all must come a coding definition which makes sense, which covers all the findings observed, and which is so objective that any two scorers can readily agree on the presence or absence of the characteristic being coded. The result is the formal coding definition of the need for power. (pp. 6-7)

The second major task of both Winter and McClelland is to establish theories of the need-Power and how it influences people in social and interpersonal situations. Winter discusses this in terms of the legend of Don Juan, concluding that "power is a form of conquest; arising from an ambivalent fear of a powerful and binding mother, and symbolized by the sexual degradation of women. Yet in the end, power is a fleeting illusion, because in death it inexorably ends with the swallowing up of even the most powerful man" (p. 200). Winter next discusses the need for power and its effect on society, concluding that "n-Power is associated with movements that emphasize norms but do not attempt to change values, [which] fits with the occupations that tend to be high in n-Power: teaching,

psychology, the clergy, business management, and leadership in urban renewal" (p. 211). Finally, Winter analyzes the power motives of powerful leaders in society - in this case American presidents. He says, "Power motivation is associated with powerful actions and effects - war, territorial change, and rapid turnover of advisors. If these general qualities of strength and activity are positive values, and if the specific outcomes are thought to be appropriate for the society, then n-Power will be associated with positive judgement and evaluation" (p. 220).

McClelland, in his book, Power, The Inner Experience, spends much less time describing the measurement of n-Power, and much more time with an elaborate developmental theory of the need for power. He breaks down n-Power into four stages depending on whether the source of power is inside or outside the self, and whether the object of power is inside or outside the self. These stages are described as follows: Stage 1: It strengthens me. I receive personal power from outside. This is an oral, being supported stage, with an "action correlate" of power oriented reading. Stage 2: I strengthen, control, direct myself. This is an anal, autonomous, "will oriented" stage, with a correlate of accumulating prestige possessions. Stage 3: I have an impact (influence) on others. This stage is phallic, involving assertive action, with a correlate of competitive sports or arguing. Stage 4: It (religion, laws, the group) moves me to serve, influence others. This is a stage of "genital mutuality, principled assertion, duty," with a correlate of organizational membership. Thus, McClelland's four stages of power are correlated with Freudian

psycho-sexual stages, with possible pathologies (hysteria, obsessiveness, etc.), with certain occupations, and with general styles of actions which the individual will find satisfying (pp. 12-14). McClelland attempts to relate these stages of power with increasing personal maturity.

> Boys start out normally by identifying strongly with their mothers [in stage 1]. . . . They are caught up in the world of thought, fantasy, and dreaming, as if they want to remain united in this way with a kind of mother principle. If they advance, they find it necessary to break with all organized responsibility and to show signs of self-control and self-direction, to be strong on their own. This trend is accentuated at Stage 3, when they become typically more assertive, identify with the "male principle," and begin to act like miniature Don Juans. . . . Finally, if all goes well, they give up their ego-centric assertiveness, submit to institutional authority, and join in a mutually rewarding relationship with their wives. (p. 74)

The theory is then developed in terms of n-Power and the impact on society. It can be noted that, first, there is a strongly Freudian undercurrent to the developmental thought of McClelland, and second, that there is a strong value judgement implicit in becoming "mature," achieving the Stage 4 power orientation, and thus joining (or rejoining) society. Other schools of psychology might well advocate one of the other stages (e.g., Stage 2 - autonomy) as the "to be strived for," "mentally healthy" stage of development.

McClelland goes on to apply this theory of power to the study of a national character - that of India - to both demonstrate that the study of national character is possible and to give an analysis of a "feminine," "passively oriented" national character (p. 123). He then relates the variables of n-Power and n-Achievement to war, leadership, and societal change, concluding that different conditions

(e.g., high n-Power with low n-Achievement) are the grounding conditions or even causes of war and peace, strong versus weak leadership, societal change versus stagnation.

The theories of McClelland and Winter are suggestive, and their attempt to measure the n-Power is the only such systematic attempt reported in the literature. It should be noted, again, that the experience of power and powerlessness is not what is measured or studied. Rather, the need for power is measured, rather than the extent or presence of power or powerlessness. This is an important point for our purposes, because the present study answers a prior question: What is this power/powerlessness which people are motivated to attain? As noted, Winter and McClelland's definitions are based on common sense. Material possessions, high offices, the psychological experimenter's position are all assumed to manifest high n-power, where power is identified with the "can" - being able to do what one desires (Winter, 1973, p. 4).

Social, Political and Economic Power

Certain writers have written on power, concentrating less on its definition or attempting to scientifically investigate and/or measure the experience, but more investigating its social, political and economic implications. Among these writers are Berle, Sorokin, Gamson, Haley, Felker, Sampson and Lasswell. In addition, other writers such as McClelland, Winter and Russell (above) have theorized about social and political implications for their theories. While it would be a digression to detail all these social, political and economic theories, the actual definitions and conceptualizations of power they utilize may prove instructive.

Adolf Berle's (1969) book, Power, is a good example of a book in this class. Berle is concerned both with describing power and the laws under which it operates, and detailing political and economic manifestations of power. It is interesting to note that Berle does not define what power is. The definition is given implicitly: It seems to involve the imposition of one's will on other people. This will can then determine political and economic systems and/or major occurrences (as well as interpersonal outcomes on a smaller scale). Berle states that the "greatest single study of power on record [is] Niccolo Machiavelli's The Prince. . ." (p. 19). This indicates the context or direction within which Berle understands power. He sees power as being opposed to reason; where power is the naked imposition of will, reason, ideas, and philosophy temper this willful action. He states, "thought and reason can challenge power," but power needs thought and reason; either alone leads to chaos (p. 8). Thus, power seems equated or similar to force. Similarly, Berle compares power to property. "Property and power are essentially the same substance" (p. 9). "Property and power may be the same phenomenon in different phases of development" (p. 23). This analysis is one of economic history; Berle refers to the feudal lords of the middle ages as having power insofar as they possessed property. By extension, they and they alone could decide what happened on that property. Further, the Marxian concept of the dis-enfranchised working class was compared to the property owners - the landed gentry - who controlled the economic and political institutions. The mine owner (he who owned that piece of property) decided when the mine worker (not possessing

property) worked, the wages he would be paid, etc.

However, Berle states that raw power is not enough in and of itself. "Nietzsche, like the Marquis de Sade, who anticipated some of his doctrines, ended in a madhouse - the only possible result of a religion of power for its own sake" (p. 32). In addition to having personally disasterous results, power when wielded with no thought of the common good, leads to the revolt of the masses. Machiavelli, Berle states, studied naked power without morality. Even he decided that the prince needed "good" laws so that the masses would not hate him. The problem, Berle observes, with twentieth century businesses, is that they have not integrated power with any morality yet (pp. 29-30).

Thus, power is seen as an imposition of will, of a person's "getting what he wants," apparently without consideration for the needs of other people. It is tempered with reason and morality if it is not to lead to chaos. This is an important point for many of the writers reviewed so far: What tempers power are <u>other</u> forces (e.g. laws, custom).- Power is the imposition of will; it is not part of power that restrains this imposition.

These thoughts are explicated by Berle in his five laws of power: (1) Order against chaos: A power vacuum is always filled by a power holder or a number of them. Reasons for this include a need for order at every level of society. Berle says, "lacking it, individuals or larger elements in a situation fly apart, seeking to find place in some order of things where they can live, work or enjoy themselves without being despoiled or interrupted" (p. 39). The second reason that power vacuums are always filled is from the nature of man: "Instinct

for power exists to some degree in everyone. Like all human instincts, it is stronger in some than in others, though never wholy absent" (p. 40).

The second law is (2) Power is invariably personal: Unlike Russell, Berle believes that power does not exist without a power holder. A group does not have power; individual(s) in the group have power. Similarly, an elite or a class does not have power; power holders may come from a certain class or elite group (p. 64). The possession of power is an emotional experience; a man may break under the pressures of power, or he may change. "One of the first impacts [of power] is the realization that the obligation of power takes precedence over other obligations formerly held nearest and dearest. A man in power can have no friends. . ." (p. 65).

Berle also states that (3) Power is invariably based on a system of ideas or philosophy: He states, "Two ingredients of power are inseparable. One is an idea system, a philosophy. The other is an institutional structure transmitting the will of the power holder. Without an idea system, institutions cannot be constructed and certainly cannot endure. Without institutions, power cannot be generated, used or expanded" (p. 84). The ideas and philosophy are the third law, the fourth (which he conceives as melding with the third) is that (4) Power is exercised through, and depends on, institutions.

The final rule is (5) Power is invariably confronted with, and acts in the presence of, a field of responsibility. The basic meaning of this is that in the exercise of power, the power holder invariably meets other people with other needs and desires and powers of their

own. In the encounter with the other, a dialogue ensues in which the original person's will and actions are tempered, and compromise results.

Berle extends his analysis first to economic power. He reviews certain historical aspects of economics from a somewhat Marxian position, and analyzes the power holders in capitalistic states. These include both the capitalists themselves - the investors, the corporate decision makers, and the organized labor movements - the workers and their leaders. Berle next analyzes political power in the United States: the federal government, the office of the president, the political officers and bureaucrats, congress and the press. Similarly, he analyzes the power dynamics of the judicial power structure (the courts in the U.S.), and international power (the world wide fight of order against chaos).

Berle's analysis is instructive in many ways. In addition to his insightful observations of power, its manifestations and laws, we can begin to see part of the disagreement between different theorists of power. Berle, par excellance, is a theorist who would disagree with many of the conclusions of the existential analyses of men like Nietzsche, Tillich and May. Part of the reasons for this can be seen in Berle's concern with order versus chaos - his fear of chaos and his implicit analysis of it as being continually warded off. He states some of these pre-suppositions explicitly: "Unhappily, chaos is never too far away. . . . The most habitually orderly and law-abiding population has within it some elements whose conduct is kept within bounds only by external retraint - that is, by the presence of power. They

emerge when power no longer is there. They subside only when it returns - unless they or one fragment of them sets up a tiny power system and takes over. If not immediately filled by the power institution and institutions of the community, some boss ganster, usurper, or vigilante committee will occupy the field" (pp. 49-50).

In his book, Power and Discontent, William Gamson describes the operation of power within a community or political system in terms of the relations betwen the authorities and potential partisans. Potential partisans view power as an instrument for the achievement of personal goals. They attempt to influence the authorities and restructure institutions. Thus, partisans have an influence perspective on power. Political parties, interest groups, elite groups, conflict groups all have this common element: They are concerned with who gets what, when and how. They are oriented towards actors within the system, and concerned for how groups try to get what they want, not the consequences for social stability. Similarly, discontent is seen as an opportunity or a danger, rather than as a problem of social control.

On the other side, the authorities see the use of power as the potential for the achievement of collective goals, and the maintenance of legitimacy and compliance in the group. It is thus a social control perspective. It asks the question: How does the leadership operate to achieve societal goals most efficiently while avoiding costly side effects? The power holders are thus seen as conflict regulators, with the following orientations: The power holder is seen as the agent of

the system as a whole. He has concern for regulation of conflict, not strategies for getting what is desired. Discontent is seen as a problem to be managed, not as an opportunity or danger (pp. 1-17).

Gamson states that to understand power one must examine both of these viewpoints. "Authorities are those who . . . make binding decisions for a system" (p. 21), whereas "potential partisans [are] that set of actors who, for a given decision, are affected by the outcome in some 'significant' way" (p. 32). The relationship of these authorities with these partisans is the important relationship for the understanding of power. This relationship may be one of discontent (distrust, alienation, dis-satisfaction, dis-affection), or of trust (confidence, support, allegiance, satisfaction) (p. 38). And it is in the understanding of this relationship that one will understand the underlying power dynamics in a society or group.

Robert Lasswell, in Power and Personality, sees a very close relationship between power and politics. He states, "We speak of politicizing of human relationships when they are transformed into power relationships" (p. 16). Thus, his book is an inquiry with a socio-political objective - "the more perfect instrumentation of democratic values" (p. 9). Power is defined by Lasswell in an interpersonal context. Power involves "relationships in which severe deprivations are expected to follow the breach of a pattern of conduct" (p. 12). Thus, the role of expectation is crucial. "[One person] demands certain conduct, threatens or inflicts severe deprivations, and others validate the expectation by conformity" (p. 16) "The

degree to which X influences a decision measures the weight of the power of X. The domain of power is the people affected by it" (p. 19). Lasswell believes that power, defined in this way, is more useful than Russell's definition of power as the production of intended effects. This definition, Lasswell contends, is too broad and is only concerned with conduct (rather than intention).

From this initial political understanding of power, Lasswell goes on to ask, are there born leaders? Power is often used synonymously with leadership (p. 11), and Lasswell is concerned with analyzing the "political type person." This type of person, says Lasswell, "passes through a distinctive career line in which the power opportunities of each situation are selected in preference to other opportunities" (p. 21). The source of this preference is in the "intense and ungratified craving for deference, which is displaced on public objects, and rationalized in terms of public interest" (p. 38). Thus, the political person pursues power in an attempt to overcome low estimates of himself (p. 39). The democratic personality - getting back to his original goal - can only come when the person overcomes this low self estimate. "The democratic personality must love himself enough to love all" (p. 221).

We may conclude our examination of theorists who discuss social viewpoints on power with some of the definitions of power which they, and others, have used in their works. Sampson (1965) discusses power (see above) and states that "by power is meant the production of desired consequences in the behavior or belief of another, where

the intent to exercise personal ascendency is present. Gamson (1968) quotes several definitions of power. He refers to Simon as saying that "The statement 'A has power over B' is equivalent to the statement that 'A causes B's behavior'" (p. 60). This, is should be noted, omits the conception of intention. Gamson himself states that influence involves altering behavior from what it would have been otherwise (p. 60). In The Power Game (1969), Charles Felker compiled a series of essays by other writers. Among them is Robert Dahl who states that power is the ability of someone to influence someone else to act in a way he otherwise would not act (Felker, 1969, p. 8), whereas Max Weber is quoted as stating that power is the "choice of a man or a number of men to realize their own will in a communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action" (Felker, 1969, p. 8). William D'Antonio utilizes a division much like Gamson's and breaks power into two subclasses: Authority (basied on the position in a hierarchical structure) and influence (a "more subtle phenomenon manifested in the willingness of a people to obey other who lack formal authority') (Felker, 1969, p. 9). Tom Wolfe, in perhaps the most elegant social definition of power, entitled his essay, "The Ultimate Power: Seeing Them Jump!" (Felker, 1969, p. iv).

Conclusion

The review of the theories and research on the phenomena of power and powerlessness leaves the reader with many questions and observed disagreements. Among these are the following: What is the relationship between power and love? Are they antithetical or are they part of the same phenomenon? Is power good, evil or neutral? Alternatively, is it the use/misuse of power which leads to good or evil outcomes? Does the exercise, possession of or experience of power lead to self-actualization, to moral degradation, or is it neutral with respect to human development? Is there a striving for, craving for, or love of power? If so, is it inherent or the product of family and society? What is the relationship between power and superiority, force, the imposition of one's will on another? Does the exercise of power always take away the power of another person or group? Is power always interpersonal, or can it be within the person or between a person and objects? Is power latent, manifest, or both?

The review also demonstrates that the biases and assumptions of the theorist or researcher influence, to an extent, his conclusions. Berle serves as an example of this when he states that "unhappily, chaos is never far away," that without the exercise of power in society, the world of the strong, of "might equals right," will rapidly approach. Likewise, the social/political definitions of power universally involve

the notion that power is a power over others, involving one person's or group's dominance - for instance, Wolfe's "Seeing Them Jump" definition of power.

Thus, the review of the present literature first provides us with a basis upon which to build our research - it illuminates both the present definitions and contexts from which these definitions were made to us. Secondly, it throws light on the contradictions and questions raised by the present work, and gives us a secondary objective: To provide an understanding of powerlessness (and eventually power) which can ground and underlie these disparate understandings of the phenomena and serve as a starting point for further research.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology used for the phenomenological study of powerlessness. It briefly describes the phenomenological enterprise - summarizing its purpose and approach. It then discusses the general methodology of phenomenological studies - the bracketing of natural attitudes and imaginative variation. Following this, the specific methodology followed in this study is presented: the techniques used to collect data and the operations performed to analyze it, including the factor analytic operations.

The phenomenological method is one which is patently not normative in modern psychology. It uses a special language and terminology, and it relies extensively on existential-phenomenological philosophy. Both of these are often unfamiliar to most research psychologists. Thus, this chapter presumes an initial familiarity with the phenomenological approach and method, to save what could easily constitute a several hundred page explanation. This approach and method are based on those of the Duquesne Circle of American phenomenological psychologists; the reader is referred for more extensive background to Amedeo Giorgi's Psychology as a Human Science, Paul Colaizzi's Reflection and Research in Psychology, and Giorgi et al. (eds.) Duquesne Studies in Phenomenological Psychology (Vol's I and II).

For a more detailed explanation of the specific methodology employed in this study, its rationale, development and variations, the reader is referred to W. Bruck, "Toward a phenomenological approach and method for psychological research" (unpublished).

Phenomenology may be defined as the study of experience, done within a certain set of assumptions and within a certain context. Its purpose is to elucidate the nature of our experiences of the world in which we live. Its assumptions include a certain ontology, epistomology, and general view of man. We may very briefly summarize some of these highlights by saying, first, that ontologically, man is considered as Being-in-the-World. He is fundamentally in his world, and neither he nor the world can be conceived apart from each other. Thus, he co-constitutes the world in which he lives - his lifeworld. That is, epistomologically, he does not create the world as a product of his imagination, nor does he discover that which is already there. Neither he nor the world exist alone. He uncovers and simultaneously participates in the creation of meanings which he finds in the world. This is the nature of his experience - an uncovering, a bringing to light, meanings in the world that he already pre-reflectively lives out. Thus, we pre-reflectively live out the meaning of a chair (we sit in it), a hammer (we pound nails with it), and the other objects we meet in our world before we reflectively think about them. The phenomenological enterprise is concerned with bringing these pre-reflective meanings that we already know on some level to light - explicating them thematically.

Meanings, for phenomenologists, are always given to us partially reflectively and partially pre-reflectively. We spontaneously live out the meanings of hammers and other objects, of thoughts, experiences and emotions. The task of the phenomenologist is to take our pre-reflective experience of, for instance, powerlessness, and bring it to light - to elucidate its fundamental structure and meaning. We do not co-constitute these meanings alone or solipsistically. Rather, we are also fundamentally Being-in-the-World-with-others. We were taught our fundamental perceptions (apperceptions as Murray would put it) of the world by others, and it is within the context of others that we live in the world. Thus, we may use the accounts of others' experiences to help us elucidate our own pre-reflective experiences. The experiences of others, then, are considered as containing fundamentally human structure, meanings and significances. We dialogue our own experiences with them, in a give and take.

We may, then, refer back to our present project. We are utilizing the phenomenological method for answering the question, "What is the experience of powerlessness?" In doing so, we are attempting to examine our already present pre-reflective experience and knowledge of what powerlessness is. We are attempting to dialogue this present understanding with the experiences of others. By doing so, we will arrive at a more reflective, thematic understanding of the fundamental structure and significance of the experience of powerlessness. This structure, or essence, of powerlessness is exactly that: the essential, essence-tial, qualities which constitute the meaning of powerlessness

for the experimenter in his own life. As this understanding is arrived at in dialogue with the understandings of others, and remembering the essentially intersubjective nature of our experiences, this structure should then be a general structure of the significance of powerlessness for us as human beings.

Phenomenological Method: General

There are two principal aspects of the phenomenological method which are present in every investigation which stems from the writings of the phenomenological and existential-phenomenological writers such as Martin Heidegger, Edmund Husserl, Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty. These are termed imaginative variation and the bracketing of one's natural attitude. They shall be considered separately here, and each briefly described.

Bracketing Natural Attitude

In using his reflective powers, man constantly conceptualizes about the world, and specifically about his own experiences of the world. We put constructs on this experience in an attempt to understand it better. In doing so we distance ourselves from our direct pre-reflective experience of that world. (We also become distinctively human in so doing; this distancing is not considered bad.) Some of these conceptualizations and constructs are: Seing a tree as a coordinated grouping of molecules, atoms and sub-atomic particles of a specified nature in a specified structure; conceiving of one event causing another; understanding human behavior with constructs such as id, ego, response sets, operant conditions, Being-needs, etc. These attitudes, beliefs and intellectual constructs are collectively known as our "natural attitude." It is natural in the sense that it is the attitude or set with which we habiatually approach the world.

Unfortunately, while the natural attitude helps us to conceptualize and think about our world, it also presents certain problems. One of these is that it hides phenomena from our gaze. It covers up our experience of the world with our thoughts (natural attitude) about that world. Thus, the phenomenologist, in attempting to see phenomena as they are in themselves, "brackets" this natural attitude. That is, piece by piece, he takes his pre-suppositions and puts them in brackets, puts them aside, and views his experience afresh. There is a philosophic argument among phenomenologists which need not concern us here as to whether or not the natural attitude can in fact be bracketed completely, to allow a completely unbiased and unrestricted view of the phenomenon. The methodology of this paper tends towards that of Merleau-Ponty which would say "no" to this question, that the most we can do is to make explicit as many of our biases as we can recognize and bracket others. Some, however, will still remain. (See also on this point Giorgi, 1975, pp. 94 & 101.)

Examples of bracketing one's natural attitude involve setting aside our psychological theories, conceptions of causality, and the like. For instance, I may reflect on powerlessness and think something like, "I was definitely powerless, but it was mainly unconscious, I didn't realize it." At this point I would stop myself and bracket the "unconscious" and attempt to restate what I was thinking in terms of how I experienced it. It might suffice to say, "I was not aware of it, but when Sam pointed it out, I realized that I had been feeling powerless." In another situation, I might think, "I was powerless, which caused me to feel depressed and lonely." Putting it this way

implies that there was one event or process (powerlessness), that then produced another event or process (depression and loneliness). This was not given in the experience, but rather was our construction of it. It, too, would be bracketed and re-formulated in a way as to more directly reflect the experience: "I was powerless and depressed," or possibly, "I felt powerless; a few minutes later, I felt depressed."

In bracketing the natural attitude, we achieve a greater openness to the phenomenon. Being open to the phenomenon means letting it speak to us, not deciding a priori what categories or constructs it will be fit into, but rather taking it on its own terms. As Merleau-Ponty might say, the world calls out meanings to us, and being open is being able to listen to them. This openness is accomplished by bracketing the natural attitude; by putting aside, temporarily, the pre-conceptions, theories, constructs, ideas and other intellectual "equipment" which might get in the way of perceiving the phenomenon as it gives itself.

Imaginative Variation

In reflecting on our experiences and the experiences of others, the phenomenological method also employs imaginative variation. In this, the phenomenological psychologist mentally varies the situation, making different parts of it happen differently, and examining the result. For instance, in one protocol discussed below, the subject felt angry, and then felt guilty that he was angry. In varying this mentally, we can imagine the powerless situation; we can imagine ourselves

feeling angry and outraged; we can imagine ourselves feel guilty as we realize the extent of this anger. Then we can vary the situation: we can imagine the powerlessness, the anger and outrage, but without the guilt. Does this change the essential nature of the situation as being powerless for us? In this case it does not seem to. I would feel equally powerless whether or not I felt guilty about being angry. Thus, the guilt is not of the essence of powerlessness. (Alternatively, if we say yes, then guilt in some way does participate in the essence of powerlessness.)

In The Structure of Behavior, Merleau-Ponty describes imaginative variation as follows:

> This intuition of essences, like induction, as we have seen, is based on facts. The difference is that [this intuition of essences] is based on the imaginary 'free variation' of certain facts. In order to grasp an essence, we consider a concrete experience, and then we make it change in our thought, trying to imagine it as effectively modified in all respects. That which remains invariable through these changes is the essence of the phenomenon in question. (1963, p. 70)

Attitude

The final characteristic of the phenomenological method, in general, is the attitude of the researcher. Attitude is not uniquely important to the phenomenological researcher. To construct a good experiment in, for example, the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, one must approach the situation with a certain "set." One must have concern for selecting a proper baseline, one must anticipate problems with the experimental design and/or equipment. One must weigh how to do the experiment to best conserve money and manpower. Knowing the

operations to follow in an experiment from reading, for example, Sidman's Tactics of Scientific Research, will not guarantee a successful course of experiments. One also needs a certain analytical style of thinking, a "feel" for schedules and shaping behavior, a certain perspective enabling the prospective experimenter to take into account possible confounding variables, alternative explanations, etc.

What is the corresponding attitude with which the phenomenological psychologist attempts to approach his research? It is certainly one in which the research remains open to the phenomenon, bracketing his natural attitude and employing imaginative variation. It is one in which the experimenter thinks less in terms of linear cause and effect. It is one in which the investigator puts aside his customary style of thinking of hypotheses, variables, and more generally of critical analysis. One generally thinks in terms of structure, of empathic understanding of the subject's material, of a holistic approach to the problem (without clearly defined boundaries or solutions). More generally, the phenomenological attitude is one which can appropriate and embrace, at least for the time of the research, the phenomenological approach, its assumptions, goals, and characteristics. (For a further discussion of this approach see Bruck, unpublished, 1976.)

This attitude is perhaps the most important key to the phenomenological research. Without it, no set of operations will guide the researcher to the structures of phenomena. (This is why students of phenomenological psychology in my experience must learn the approach before attempting the method; otherwise they spontaneously and

persistently think analytically, in terms of cause and effect, moderator variables, etc., rather than what is given directly in their own experience.) With the attitude, the set of operations discussed below serve as guides, as signposts. They help the researcher to stay on track and to productively reflect on his own experience.

Data Collection

In examining the question of the collection of data, we must ask several questions: What constitutes data? How can we best collect it? How much of it do we need? To answer these questions, the first consideration is the question which the research is attempting to answer: What is the nature of the experience of powerlessness? The data which immediately seem relevant are exactly the experiences of powerlessness. Thus, the type of data which is collected is accounts of these experiences, both from the experimenter himself and from other subjects. In soliciting these experiences, the purpose of so doing must be kept clearly in mind: The investigator, as a necessary condition to his investigation of the experience of powerlessness, already knows what powerlessness is, at some level. This knowledge, to a greater or lesser degree, is implicit and pre-reflective. His purpose in doing the investigation is to bring to light this pre-reflective knowledge; to explicate it and show it for itself. Thus, protocols (accounts of experiences) are obtained in order to help the researcher bring his own implicit knowledge to thematic awareness and language it in a communicable manner.

Protocols were solicited for this research as follows: Students of mine and I asked different people to describe a situation or situations in which they felt powerless, using the following format:

> Please remember back to a time when you felt powerless. I would like you to describe this experience as completely as you can. What was the situation? What did you do, and what did others do? What were your feelings at the time? What thoughts or perceptions did you have during the experience? Was there an identifiable beginning or ending to the experience? Please try, in your description, to be as concrete and specific as you can. Please do not reflect on the experience or discuss what you now think about it or how you now interpret it. As much as you can, I would like to just capture the actual experience that you went through.

This protocol was followed up by an interview in which the researcher asked the subject about the areas in the protocol that were unclear to him. Protocols were originally obtained both by having the subject write down the experience and by taping oral accounts. The latter was found not to give substantially more information, but resulting in much longer protocols as the subjects would talk far more than they would write. As the initial analyses by my students seemed to show no difference between the two, subsequent protocols were obtained in writing.

Obtaining data in this way follows the methods of Giorgi (1971) and Colaizzi (1973) in obtaining accounts of experiences in "naturalistic" rather than laboratory settings. This is considered more appropriate than a standardized laboaratory setting; Giorgi states that rigor for phenomenological psychology comes in capturing the same theme through different manifestations in situations (i.e., the same meaning for the subject) rather than standardizing the situation (i.e., the same meaning for the experimenter)(Giorgi, 1971). Further, the phenomenological approach attempts to return to the lifeworld of the subjects. It attempts to capture the experiences of the subjects holistically -

within the context that they naturally occur - rather than under artificial conditions (and thus different contexts and horizons of meaning than the subject's lifeworld).

Approximately 50 protocols were obtained by my students and myself. Situations ranged from very physical situations of powerlessness (being caught in a rip-tide, a car out of control), through emotional and physical situations (being arrested for drugs, being incarcerated in prison), to more purely "emotional" or "mental" situations (being unable to assert oneself with parents, being powerless to help a friend with his depression). Analyses were performed on all of these by my students to a greater or lesser depth; and all were read by me to give me an overview of the different types of powerless situations.

This brings up again one of our original questions: How many protocols are necessary for the investigation? The basic answer to this question is as many as the investigator needs to help him explicate his own experience of the phenomenon. Specifically, the experimenter solicits protocols until he stops learning new things about the phenomenon, until he stops getting any appreciable amount of new information. In practise, this usually takes about a dozen protocols (for common experiences such as powerlessness, anger, etc.). In this case, I had the opportunity of examining a much larger number which offered a greater breadth of situations of powerlessness. It is interesting to note, however, that even the superficial phenomenological analyses of these protocols indicated that the same underlying structure was present in apparently situationally disparate experiences.

This highlights one of the difficulties with the phenomenological method. We discussed above that protocols are protocols for the researcher, embodying the experience of powerlessness as it is experienced by the subject. It is for this reason that laboratory experiences are less appropriate - they are pre-defined experiences that the researcher must assume will be powerless (and powerless in a naturalistically relevant sense) to the subject. For similar reasons it is difficult to obtain protocols which are comprehensive - that cover the range of possible experiences of the phenomena in question. If we try to do this (as I actually did informally above by categorizing the protocols into emotional versus physical situations) we are putting our pre-defined constructs on that phenomenon and vitiating the root of the phenomenological methodology. We are taking the meaning of the other's experience <u>for us</u> (it is emotional versus physical) rather than being open to the client's meaning and experience. In fact, in this investigation, the pilot study seemed to show that such a broad range was unnecessary, as the structures (the meanings to the subjects) of the experiences of radically different situations (<u>to us</u>) were identical.

However, the caveat must be made. The researcher stops obtaining new protocols when he stops getting new information. However, there is no guarantee that 64 protocols later he might not come across one which would fundamentally alter his structure. This is a weakness in the methodology, which is partially dealt with in several ways: First is imaginative variation - the researcher varies the situation in his mind. In fact, in the structure of powerlessness below, through

this method, one resolution of powerless situations that was not described in any protocols was explicated. Secondly, the phenomenological result is and must be considered not as an objectively valid result for all time and for all people. It is a result in dialogue, both with other researchers and with other clients. As clients (or reseachers) describe experiences which do not fit into the current structure, the structure is and must remain open to modification and dialogue with other data. Finally, it might be pointed out that the phenomenological study is an in-depth analysis of experience. As such it can do much to facilitate our understanding of experiences that the more traditional methodologies cannot. In doing so, however, it gives up certain other advantages. Certainly, precision and objective certitude are lessened (or at the very least conceived of differently) than in experimental studies. This is another characteristic and shortcoming of the phenomenological method that the researcher must remain aware of.

Protocol Analysis

The data for the phenomenological study is thus the accounts of the experiences of powerlessness (protocols). These protocols are obtained from both the experimenter himself and from other subjects. They are analyzed, generally, using imaginative variation, bracketing one's natural attitude, and within the phenomenological attitude. The specific operations which were used to facilitate these general principles can be broken down into several steps and discussed separately. They include (1) initial reading, (2) meaning units, (3) combinations, (4) themes, (5) clusters, (6) fundamental situated or general description, and (7) fundamental structure. The analyses were carried out on two levels: Each protocol was analyzed separately, resulting in fundamental situated descriptions. Then the situated descriptions were combined into a general description, and a fundamental general structure was obtained from this. Again, this specific methodology follows that of Giorgi and Colaizzi with certain variations, and is detailed in Bruck (unpublished, 1976).

Initial Reading

The initial reading is done, as Giorgi notes, to get an overall, holistic sense of the protocol. It is read with no conscious attempt to reflect or vary the situation, but merely to be open to what it has to say. In this initial reading (especially of many protocols) one

can get an idea of the different manifestations of the phenomenon, and some beginning sense of commonalities between the differing situations.

Meaning Units

In the next stage, the protocol is broken down into meaning units. A meaning unit is anything that says something of discrete importance or significance to the researcher. Different researchers will have different sets of meaning units for the same protocol. In part, this is a stylistic difference - while some researchers will break down each sentence almost by clauses, others will take whole groups of phrases and sentences as one meaning unit. As with many other aspects of the analysis, the meaning units are for-the-researcher. He should break them down into meaning units that will help him to gain understanding of the whole.

In this stage the original phraseology of the entire protocol is usually retained in order not to inadvertently omit something of importance. During the next stages parts can be eliminated, but this should only be done after reflection has shown them not essential to the structure of the experience.

Combinations

After the protocol is broken down into meaning units, the researcher may take an extra step: The meaning units are re-read, and ones which are completely repetitive are combined. Often the subject will repeat something like, "I felt angry," or "I was powerless;" these statements

can be combined. Further, if there are statements which do not relate to the phenomenon at all - for instance, where the subject starts talking about another interesting although completely unrelated experience, these statements may be eliminated. Before doing this the investigator should, through imaginative variation, determine whether the statements are, in fact, unrelated. If possible, the researcher may in the inquiry ask the subject what relation apparently disparate remarks have.

Themes

In the next stage each meaning unit is interrogated for its significance for the experience in question. For example, we might look at a meaning unit and ask ourselves, "What does this tell us about powerlessness? What is the underlying significance of the subject's statement?" In this stage, some of the specificity of the situation is transcended and usually the theme is phrased in terms of "the subject" rather than the original "I".

For readability, meaning units and themes are usually listed across from each other on the same page. This helps the reader to see exactly which statement is generating which theme, and he can shift back and forth between the two levels of analysis.

Clusters

From the themes, the next step is to reflect and obtain a fundamental (or situated) description of the phenomenon. In doing this it is very often helpful to first reflect on the themes as they are listed

and see if any groupings or clusters stand out. Often themes will seem to have certain subjects which they center around as the investigator re-reads the list of them. At other times, if the researcher just lets his mind "relax," as he reads through the protocol, meaning units and/or themes, key words may stand out for him. These may be metaphorical in nature, and facilitate his structuring the underlying meaning of the protocol.

In considering the themes by clusters, there is an initial categorization or division of the protocol into component parts. This is done holistically: The researcher keeps in mind that the division is his to facilitate his understanding, rather than given in the experience, and these clusters will be re-integrated into a whole in the next level of analysis.

Situated Description

At this point, the researcher must begin reflecting on the clusters as he discerned them, and may also refer back to the protocol as a whole, the meaning units or the themes. The researcher at this point engages in phenomenological reflection - imaginative variation and bracketing - to relate the clusters back into a whole function. This description is a presentation of the essential elements which constituted the experience of powerlessness in this particular situation; as such, it presents the clusters re-integrated into a whole, complete structure. It may not refer to the specific situation mentioned in the original protocol, and it may use metaphor to communicate the understanding, but it in some way reflects the essential elements of the original experience.

The description is termed situated since it is based on the specific situation the subject describes. It may not accurately reflect the fundamental elements of other powerless situations. However, obviously, since the researcher varies the situation in his mind while reflecting on the protocol, it is not completely specific to the situation. It does in some ways transcend that situation, but makes no particular effort to embrace all possible situations.

Final Analysis

After the analyses of each protocol are performed, another level of analysis takes place. In this analysis, the situated descriptions are used as a starting point, and a fundamental general description and a fundamental structure are arrived at.

Fundamental General Description

For this analysis, the researcher reads over all the situated descriptions he has obtained, along with other protocols which have not been analyzed. In reflecting on these, he may consider which elements are common throughout all protocol analyses. More importantly, however, he looks at elements which appear at first glance to be disparate and attempts to find more fundamental structures which embrace both apparently contradictory structures. The result is a description of the experience of powerlessness which underlies the different situated descriptions, as well as the original protocols themselves.

Fundamental Structure

The final level of analysis results in a fundamental structure, which expresses the essence of the experience of powerlessness. In this level, the researcher examines the fundamental descriptions and reflects further on them. The descriptions tell, basically, what

happens to a person in the experience of powerlessness. Put crudely, the investigator then asks the question, "So what?" What is the significance of these happenings for the person's life? What is their underlying meaning? Colaizzi distinguishes between these final levels as follows:

> In approaching the [Fundamental Description] the researcher seeks to present what is essential to the explicit description of the experiential phenomenon under investigation; and in the [Fundamental Structure], the researcher seeks to descriptively disclose the [Fundamental Structure] of the experiential phenomenon by thoroughly explicating it; i.e., making explicit what is implicit, and by precisely articulating its essential structure. In short, the [Fundamental Description] refers to the essence of a phenomenon as it is experienced, whereas the [Fundamental Structure] refers to the essence of an experiential phenomenon as it is revealed by explication, i.e., 'the process in which the constituent elements of a thing are revealed without the addition of new elements.' (1973, p. 33)

Factor Analytic Method

This section describes the methodology used in arriving at a factor analytic structure of powerlessness. In summary, the fundamental description and fundamental structure of powerlessness were obtained from the phenomenological investigation. These results were examined in order to obtain items hypothesized to constitute the experience of powerlessness. These items were then made into a questionnaire. Subjects were asked to remember an experience of powerlessness and taken through verbal guided imagery to help them to re-experience the situation vividly. Then the questionnaire was administered to them. The results of the questionnaire were factor analyzed and the factors constituting the structure of powerlessness obtained.

Subjects

Criteria for subjects included availability, familiarity with tasks involving imagery, facility with written tasks (specifically questionnaires), and ideally a geographic distribution. On the basis of these criteria it was decided to use undergraduate students at the University of Florida. Students taking Psychology 201 were used, and assumed to be representative of the undergraduate population at the university. To further randomize the volunteer population, students in Behavioral Science classes were asked

to take the questionnaire as a group. Over 96% of students requested in this manner participated. The total number of subjects was 194; of these, 88 were male and 106 female. Behavioral Science courses provided 74 subjects, 117 were psychology students, and 3 were other undergraduates. Subjects ranged in age from 17 to 50; the man age was 19.9, and 169 subjects were between 18 and 22. There were 150 subjects from Florida and 43 from other parts of the country. There were 107 subjects from large cities (over 100,000), 65 from smaller towns (20,000-100,000), and 19 from rural areas (under 20,000). One hundred forty-nine of the subjects were run in groups ranging from 20-30; the other 45 were run individually. Twenty-two subjects were run twice at the same task with a 14 day interval for test-retest reliability.

Experimenter

The experimenter was a 26 year old, white male graduate student in psychology. All subjects were run by the same experimenter.

Instrument

The instrument was a 45 item questionnaire (see Appendix 1), consisting of 33 items based on the results of the phenomenological research, plus 12 "dummy" items. The 33 items were assumed to be constituents of powerless experiencing. The items were chosen by first examining the phenomenological results and breaking them down into separate statements about powerlessness. These statements

were then examined and hypothetical constructs obtained which would possibly be the factors obtained in the analysis. There were originally 8 hypothetical factors: Emotionality, Altered State of Experiencing, Out of Control, Resolution, Attribution of Responsibility, Search for Alternatives, The Body, Cognitive Components, Action Taken, and Importance of Projects. Upon further examination, Resolution and Attribution of Responsibility were eliminated as being tautological (items for each merely listed the logical possibilities and stated that one would be followed). The Body was eliminated for lack of test items. Cognitive Components, Action Taken and Importance of Projects were combined into other factors, leaving 3 factors remaining: Emotionality, Altered State of Experiencing, and Out of Control. Upon examination of the first construct (Emotionality), it appeared that there were four emotions that seemed distinct: anger, depression, isolation, and worthlessness (dis-affirmation). As these might or might not cluster together, they were considered separate factors, with a possible second order factor of emotionality.

Using, then, each of the six resultant factors, items were selected from the statements originally generated that hypothetically would load on them. Further items were generated, when necessary, to give an adequate number for each factor. For instance, synonyms for anger (rage, hostility) were incorporated into the questionnaire. Appendix 2 details the questionnaire items and hypothesized constructs.

The items were all expressed as unipolar constructs. Several items could have been bipolar, but others were only unipolar, so the choice was made to consider all in the same way for consistency. A 7 point Likert scale was used for each item.

Further, 12 items were included as dummy items in order to test for discriminant validity. Following the construction of the questionnaire, it was decided that the most appropriate way to insert dummy items to have them fit in with the rest of the questionnaire was to insert additional adjectives. Adjectives were chosen that measured another construct which should not correlate with powerlessness. Using Gough's (1965) Adjective Check List, adjectives which measured "lability" were chosen. From the lability scale, words were selected which either would probably be answered equally "yes" and "no" (e.g., forgiving) and words which would most probably be answered "no" in a powerless experience (e.g., enthusiastic). (See Appendix 3)

Procedure

A group of subjects (or individual subject) was asked to participate in the study. Subjects were briefly told of the purpose of the study, i.e., to investigate the similarities and differences in the way people experience being powerless, and then asked to sign a "consent" form (agreeing to participate in the study). They were also told that a more full explanation of the study and results would be given them, if they liked, at

the end of the experiment. Subjects were then asked to think about a specific time when they felt powerless. They were told that no definition of the term could be given (as that was the end goal of the experiment), but that the experience should be a concrete situation that happened at a specific time (rather than a long term process), and one which they could remember clearly. Subjects, if they desired, were also given examples of situations which others had chosen. (These examples were ones which seemed to encompass the different types given previously.)

After thinking of a situation, subjects were asked to try and remember it as vividly as they could and were given the following instructions:

> Try to remember first about how you got into the situation. Did you get yourself into it? Was another person responsible? or was it an act of fate? How did you feel towards other people involved in the situation? Were there others "caught" in it, too? bystanders? people responsible? How did you feel towards each? More generally, what feelings did you have? One or many? Strong or in the background? Can you remember specifically what they were? What about your thoughts - were there a lot of them in your head? What were they about? Did the situation come upon you quickly (like a surprise) or did you know it was going to happen? What did you do? What did others do? What did you <u>try</u> to do? Did you perceive things differently at the time - for instance, did time seem to go by fast? slow? How about the end of the experience? Did it ever end? Are you still stuck in it? If it did end, did it end cleanly? quickly? or did it sort of hang on? Did you get yourself out of it or did someone else help?

Following these instructions, the questionnaires were handed out. Subjects were asked to write a sentence or two describing the experience so that the experimenter could understand what they had gone through before the subjects completed the questionnaire. (This was done for 170 of the subjects.) Subjects were told certain definitions of words which others had indicated were unclear (e.g., thwarted, dis-affirmed, reflective) and invited to ask about other unclear words. After the questionnaire was filled out, subjects were offered the opportunity of asking questions about the research.

For the 22 subjects run twice, the experimenter asked the first 12 men and 12 women to be run individually if they would like to answer some more questions about powerlessness in two weeks. All of them said yes (although 2 did not return). Fourteen days after the first trial they were allowed to review what they had written about the experience (although not the answers to the questionnaire) and then given the questionnaire a second time to fill out.

Statistics

The data were analysed as follows: Demographic data were obtained from the end of the questionnaire (age, residence, etc.) and totalled. The brief statement of the experience was classified as either (a) a physical situation (being physically powerless); (b) not purely or primarly physical; or (c) unknown.

Answers to the questions, sex, classification of the experience, and test versus retest were put on computer cards.

Correlations (Pearson, Spearman, Kendall) were obtained between each of the 45 questionnaire items. The data for the 194 subjects (excluding retest data) were factor analyzed, first without rotation, and then using the varimax (orthogonal) rotation, and plots of the factors (Factor 1 against Factor 2, etc.) obtained. The factor analyses were repeated two more times for reliability, first excluding the dummy items, and then using a high cut-off Eigenvalue (to reduce the number of factors retained). Analyses of subsets of the data were performed two ways. Data were first analyzed by sex. Secondly, on the basis of a short two sentence description of the experience subjects were requested to put on the bottom of the questionnaires, situations were divided into purely physical powerlessness and "other" situations. Analyses were performed on each of these sets of protocols separately. Each factor analysis was done first without rotation and then using the varimax rotation. Eigenvalues for the factors to be retained were chosen (except for the high Eigenvalue solution) at 1.0 (approximate cumulative share of accounted for variance being 66%).

For test-retest reliability, the answers to items loading on Factor 1 after rotation (the major factor) were totalled and correlated for the 22 subjects between their tests and retests.

CHAPTER IV
PHENOMENOLOGICAL RESULTS

Introduction

To obtain data for the phenomenological investigation, protocols were obtained using the format described above. These descriptions of the experience of powerlessness were obtained both by myself and by students of mine. They were obtained from the investigator himself (introspective protocols), and from other subjects. Subjects ranged in age from late teens to fifties, and the experiences of powerlessness were quite varied. The result was 49 protocols of the experience of powerlessness. There were also 18 initial phenomenological analyses of protocols prepared by my students.

The present investigation started with my reading and re-reading the initial 49 protocols to get a sense of the situations that were experienced as powerless and some initial feel for the quality of the experiences. The analyses were also read and re-read; six shed some light on the phenomenon for me. Twelve protocols were selected for the final analysis. Two of these were my own protocols, five were from other subjects which I obtained, and five were obtained by my students.

To best present these data and their analysis, this chapter is organized as follows: First, one sample protocol is presented, along

with its analysis. All of the steps in the analysis described in the last chapter are presented in order that the reader can follow the steps and rationale in the analysis. In order for the reader to have an opportunity to see the other data and the results of the data analyses, several other protocols are then presented. Since the full analysis (complete with all the intermediate steps) would be extensive reading, only the protocols and fundamental situated descriptions obtained from it are presented. (Intermediate levels of analysis are available from the author.)

Following this is a section in which the reflections leading to the fundamental general description are discussed. These, while not comprising all the thoughts and reflections I went through, do detail some of the major commonalities and differences observed between the protocols, and ways in which they were combined in the general description.

Following the presentation of my reflections and the subsequent fundamental general description, one further step is made. The description is subjected to further analysis and reflection to obtain the fundamental structure of powerlessness.

The protocols that are presented are taken from among the 12 that I did formal analyses of. The original 48 protocols described powerless situations from people who ranged from their teens to fifties, from lower socio-economic to upper middle class, from unemployed persons, students and successful professionals, involving situations that included being a prisoner, being arrested, being in an out of

control car or being swept out to sea, the death or illness of a loved one, being ordered to do things by authorities or parents, etc. Thus, a wide range of potential subjects and situations were studied.

From these, I took my 12 protocols, and selected them on the basis of several criteria. First was that a range of different types of powerless situations was demonstrated. To do this, situations were chosen that included "acts of fate" as well as ones the subject could have averted, ones that happened quickly and ones which took some time, ones that "objectively" seemed important and ones which seemed trivial, and ones in which the subject was "psychologically" versus "physically" restrained. Second, a range in subjects was preferred. Thus, subjects were both male and female, ranging in age from 18 to 50. Third, the protocols were ones which spoke to me, the researcher, easily. That is, they were descriptions which were both concrete and fairly succinct, that identified the situations, emotions and thoughts the person had, which seemed clearly to be powerless situations, and which seemed coherent and understandable to me. One final criterion was that protocols were preferred from subjects who were available; thus, the fundamental descriptions were checked out with the subjects after they were performed (as was the general description), and any further questions about the protocols were able to be asked.

As with most research, the different criteria had to be compromised with each other in the selection of data presented above. Thus, although originally protocols included those of lower class prisoners,

for the sake of protocol coherence and completeness and subject availability, none of these are included here. Similarly, some of the better protocols for coherence are not presented in the interests ofhaving a fairly diverse sample. The result was a fairly representative sampling of the protocols that I originally read and were analyzed by me and my students.

Sample Data Analysis

The following protocol was written by the experimenter in January 1977. The analysis is presented along with comments and reflections. It is presented somewhat repetitively, with Levels A and B on one page, Levels B and C on the next, etc. This is done in order that the reader might most easily follow the changes from one level of analysis to the next.

Protocol

This morning I got up and when I looked out the window, I noticed that someone had snapped off and bent around the antenna on my car. (To give some background, I was at a friend's house for the week in Boston. When I visited her the last time for a weekend someone snapped off the antenna on my car.) When I looked out I immediately thought, "Oh no. This couldn't have happened again." I looked to be sure I had seen it right. I was overwhelmed with a feeling of powerlessness - I felt that I couldn't do anything; that nothing I could do would stop these hoodlums from ripping my car apart. I felt tremendously frustrated, and the more I thought about it, the more enraged I got at the perpetrators of this. I felt that my space had been violated in some important way. This was mine - my car - that I worked hard to get and worked hard to keep, and there was nothing I could do to keep these people from vandalizing it. I felt enraged at whoever did it. I imagined young kids ("Goddamned hoodlums" was what I thought at the time) who were just out for kicks and vandalizing property. I wished that I would have been awake when they did it. I fantasized having a gun and shooting them with it, and I felt more enraged and powerless that this fantasy could not come true, that at most I could see them do it and run after them, and in my fantasy they would get away. I wanted to destroy something, hit someone, and I was also mad at the "system" for not allowing me to have these people - that even if caught they would probably not really be punished. The predominant experience was of having been personally violated, and not being able to do anything about it. I walked around outside, looked at my car, and helplessly

looked around for something to vent my anger and rage at. I ended up shoveling snow for a while, and that really didn't make me feel any better.

Although I don't think is connected directly to feeling powerless, I also felt guilty that I would want to shoot these kids, and I felt that I shouldn't be so attached. I thought, "What's a $6.00 antenna, anyway? What are you doing being so upset at it?" I was still angry, but succeeded in mixing this with some guilt.

After a couple of hours passed (I started talking to my friend and doing something else after this and so didn't think about it much) and I started thinking about it again, I realized that I would go to the store and pay $3.00 or $5.00 and with one screw replace the antenna. Then it bothered me as a matter of principle but I didn't feel as involved with it.

Question: Did the initial $6.00 and four hours represent a lot of trouble for you?
Answer: Yes, definitely. I had to go to a lot of trouble to replace it - I had to go to the store and figure out which type of antenna was the right one, and I also was without a radio for the trip back to D.C.

Question: Did you have any particular sense of the passage of time?
Answer: When I first saw the antenna, time seemed to stop. Everything slowed down, and it was as if either I or everything else or both were in molasses - everything flowed very slowly. This continued as I looked at the car - the slowness seemed to go along with a sense of unreality about the situation. As I become angrier and angrier, time seemed to resume its normal course - events seemed to move along faster.

[These two questions at the end were points which I had not focused on when writing the protocol originally. However, in re-reading it, and reflecting on it, I realized a need for clarification on those points. In general, in gathering protocols, I added questions to the original accounts when certain things (such as the passage of time or the resolution of the situation) seemed unclear.]

Analysis

The first level of analysis (as described above) is the level of meaning units. In this, each separate word, thought or phrase that embodied and communicated a separate thought to me was separated into

a meaning unit. Insofar as possible, the original language of the protocol was retained in this level - only upon further reflection was wording changed and deleted (in order to avoid missing meanings contained in the description). In the second (B) level, the meaning units in the A level are examined and repetitive elements are combined, and elements which have nothing to do with powerlessness are deleted. Rationales for these steps are given in brackets.

Level A Analysis Meaning Units		Level B Analysis Consolidation	
1a	This morning I got up and when I looked out the window I noticed that someone had snapped off and bent around the antenna of my car.	1b	S notices that someone has snapped off and bent around the antenna of his car. [note the change from "I" to "S"; factors of time of day and looking out the window do not seem important]
2a	To give some background, I was at a friend's house for the week in Boston.	2b	S was at a friend's house.
3a	When I visited her the last time for a weekend, someone snapped off my car antenna,	3b	The last time he was there, someone had snapped off his car antenna.
4a	and I spent about $6.00 and four hours putting a new antenna on my car.		[combined with #34]
5a	When I looked out I immediately thought, "Oh no, this couldn't have happened again."	5b	Upon seeing it he immediately thought, "Oh no. This couldn't have happened again."
6a	I looked to be sure I had seen it right.	6b	S looked to be sure he had seen it right.
7a	I was overwhelmed with a feeling of powerlessness.	7b	S was overwhelmed with a feeling of powerlessness.

8a I felt that I couldn't do anything; that nothing I could do would stop these hoodlums from ripping my car apart.	8b S felt that he could do nothing; There was nothing he could do to stop these hoodlums from vandalizing his car. [also from #13a]
9a I felt remendously frustrated,	9b S felt tremendously frustrated and enraged. [also from #14a]
10a and the more I thought about it, the more enraged I got at the perpetrators of this.	10b The more he thought about it, the more enraged he got at the perpetrators.
11a I felt that my space had in some important way been violated.	11b He felt that his space had been violated in some important way. [also from #22a]
12a This was mine - my car - hat I worked hard to get and worked hard to keep,	12b His car was his; he worked hard to get and keep it.
13a and there was nothing I could do to keep these people from vandalizing it.	[combined with #8b]
14a I felt enraged at whoever did it.	[combined with #9b]
15a I imagined young kids ("Goddamned hoodlums" was what I thought at the time) who were just out for kicks and vandalizing property.	15b He imagined young kids - goddamned hoodlums - just out for kicks and vandalizing property.
16a I fantasized having a gun and shooting them with it,	16b He fantasized having a gun and shooting them with it.
17a and I felt more enraged and powerless that this fantasy could not come true,	17b He felt enraged and powerless that this fantasy could not come true.
18a that at most I could see them do it and run after them, and in my fantasy they would get away.	18b At most he could run after them if he saw them, and he fantasized they would get away even then.
19a I wanted to destroy something,	19b He wanted to destroy something

20a or hit someone	20b or hit someone.
21a and I was also mad at the "system" for not allowing me to have these people - that even if caught they would probably not really be punished.	21b He was also mad at the system for not allowing him to punish them (if he caught them) or punishing them itself.
22a The predominant experience was of having been personally violated,	[combined with #11b]
23a and not being able to do anything about it.	[combined with #8]
24a I walked around outside, looked at my car,	[deleted]
25a and helplessly looked around for something to vent my anger and rage at.	25b S helplessly looked around for something to vent his anger and rage at.
26a I ended up shoveling snow for a while,	26b S shoveled snow for a while [which seemed unsatisfactory]
27a and that really didn't make me feel any better.	27b That didn't make him feel any better.
28a Although I don't think this is connected directly to feeling powerless, I also felt guilty that I would want to shoot these kids, and I felt that I shouldn't be so attached. I thought, "What's a $6.00 antenna, anyway? Why are you so upset about it?"	[deleted - using imaginative variation the experience was considered without this guilt and no substantial difference was found]
29a I still felt angry, but succeeded in mixing this with some guilt.	[deleted]
30a After a couple of hours passed, I started talking to my friend and doing something else after this, so I didn't think about it much.	30b S started talking to his friend and did something else for a couple of hours.

31a I started thinking about it again and I realized that I would go to the store and pay $3.00 or $5.00 and with one screw replace the antenna.

31b When he started thinking about the situation again, he realized he would go to the store and pay $3.00 or $5.00 and replace the antenna with one screw.

32a Then it bothered me as a matter of principle, but I didn't feel so involved with it.

32b It still bothered him as a matter of principle, but he didn't feel as emotionally involved with it.

33a [The first time the antenna was ripped off] I had to go to a lot of trouble to replace it - I had to go to the store and figure out which type of antenna was the right one, and I also was without a radio for the trip back from Boston to D.C.

33b The first time the antenna was ripped off, S went to a lot of trouble to replace it, going to the store, finding the right one, and being without a radio for the trip home. [combined with #4a]

34a When I first saw the antenna time seemed to stop. Everything slowed down, and it was as if either I or everything else or both were in molasses - everything flowed very slowly. This continued as I looked at the car.

34b When S first saw the antenna, time seemed to stop. Everything slowed down, and it was as if either/both he and/or everything else was in molasses - everything flowed very slowly. This continued as he looked at the car.

35a The slowness seemed to go along with a sense of unreality about the situation.

35b The slowness seemed to go along with a sense of unreality about the situation.

36a As I become angrier and angrier, time seemed to resume its normal course - events seemed to more along faster.

36b As he became angrier, time seemed to resume its normal course - events seemed to more along faster.

In the next (C) level of analysis, the themes are explicated. In the theme level, each meaning unit is questioned for its meaning for the experience of powerlessness. In reflection we ask, what is significant about the subject's "helplessly looking around for something to vent his anger and rage at?" In this case, the general significance

of this is that the subject's alternative courses of satisfying action seemed to receed and disappear. The B level is also presented for easy comparison.

Level B Analysis Consolidation		Level C Analysis Themes	
1b	S notices that someone has snapped off and bent around the antenna of his car.	1c	S realizes that a possession of his which he values has been vandalized.
2b	S was at a friend's house.	2c	S was not at-home.
3b	The last time he was there someone had snapped off the car antenna.	3c	There was a repeatable nature to the phenomenon.
5b	Upon seeing it he immediately thought, "Oh no. This couldn't have happened again."	5c	S couldn't believe that it had happened; the situation was in some sense unreal.
6b	S looked to be sure he had seen it right.		[same as #5c]
7b	S was overwhelmed with a feeling of powerlessness.	7c	As S realized the situation he felt powerless.
8b	S felt that he could do nothing; there was nothing he could do to stop these hoodlums from vandalizing his car.	8c	S felt powerless in the sense that he could do nothing to prevent the situation.
9b	S felt tremendously frustrated and enraged.	9c	S felt tremendously frustrated and enraged.
10b	The more he thought about it the more enraged he got at the perpetrators.	10c	In thinking more, the rage increased.
11b	He felt that his space had been in some important way violated.	11c	S perceived the situation as a violation of his space.
12b	His car was his; he worked hard to get and keep it.		[combined with #1c]

15b He imagined young kids - Goddamned hoodlums - just out for kicks and vandalizing property.	[combined with #16c]
16b He fantasized having a gun and shooting them with it.	16c The malicious nature of the act enraged him more; he responded with fantasies of harming the perpetrators.
17b He felt enraged and powerless that this fantasy could not come true.	17c The unrealistic nature of the subject's proposed course of action grounded possibilities of his feeling more powerless and enraged. [combined with #18b]
18b At most he could run after them if he saw them, and he fantasized that they would get away even then.	[combined with #17c]
19b He wanted to destroy something.	[combined with #20c]
20c Or hit someone.	20c S felt a bursting out in a more or less directionless manner. [combined with #19c & 20c]
21b He was also mad at the system for not allowing him to punish them if he caught them or punish them itself.	[combined with #20c]
25b S helplessly looked around for something to vent his anger and rage at.	25c Possibilities of action/reaction seemed to foreclose to the subject.
26b S shoveled snow for a while.	26c A purely "physical" solution was sought which would "get his mind" off the situation; this did not succeed. [combined with #27b]
27b This didn't make him feel any better.	[combined with #26c]
30b S talked to his friend and did something else for a couple of hours.	30c S again attempts to "get his mind" off the situation by doing other things.

31b When he started thinking about the situation again, he realized he would go to the store and pay $3.00 or $5.00 and replace the antenna with one screw.	31c After time passed, S realized that repairing the damage to his property would be relatively easy.
32b It still bothered him as a matter of principle, but he didn't feel as emotionally involved with it.	32c S was not then as engaged and caught up in and by his emotions, but still at another level was bothered by it.
33b The first time the antenna was ripped off, S went to a lot of trouble to replace it, going to the store, finding the right one, and being without an antenna for his trip home.	33c The first time, it was a lot of trouble to repair the damage.
34b When S first saw the antenna time seemed to stop. Everything slowed down, and it was as if either/both he and/or everything else was in molasses - everything flowed very slowly. This continued as he looked at the car.	34c Time slows and stops as the subject first realizes the powerless situation.
35b As he become angrier, time seemed to resume its normal course and events seemed to move along faster.	35c As emotions flowed outwards, time became unbound and freed to resume its normal course.

In the next (D) level of analysis, the themes are taken from the previous level and grouped in "clusters." These are thematic elements that seem to go through the protocol. In addition to combining similarly related level C elements, more reflection is done to give a more fundamental interpretation of them. For the ease of reading, the level C is repeated below, and the cluster which that elements fits into is identified. Six clusters were used: Personal Invasion; Repetition; Emotional Response; Search for Resolution; Time and Reality; and Resolution. These were arrived at by examining the themes several times and fitting them together in sensible ways.

Level C Analysis Themes	Level D Analysis Clusters
1c S realizes that a possession of his which he values has been vandalized.	Personal invasion
2c S was not at-home.	Personal invasion
3c This was the second time this had happend (there was a repetitive element to the experience).	Repetition
5c S couldn't believe it had happened; the situation was in some sense unreal.	Time and reality
7c As S realized the situation, he felt powerless.	Personal invasion
8c S felt powerless in the sense that he could do nothing to stop this vandalism.	Personal invasion
9c S felt tremendously frustrated and enraged.	Emotional response
10c In thinking more, the rage increased.	Emotional response
11c S perceived the situation as a violation of his space.	Personal invasion
16c The malicious nature of the act enraged him more; he responded with fantasies of harming the perpetrators.	Search for resolution Emotional response
17c The unrealistic nature of the subject's proposed course of action grounded possibilities of his feeling more powerless and enraged.	Search for resolution
20c S felt a bursting out in a more or less directionless manner.	Emotional response
25c Possibilities of action/reaction seem to foreclose to the subject.	Search for resolution
26c A purely "physical" solution is sought which will "get his mind" off the situation; this does not succeed.	Search for resolution

30c S again attempts to "get his mind" off the situation by doing other things.	Search for resolution
31c After time passed, S realized that repairing the damage to his property would be relatively easy.	Resolution
32c S was not then as engaged and caught up in and by his emotions, but still at another level he was bothered by the situation.	Resolution
33c The first time it was a lot of trouble to repair the damage.	Repetition
34c Time slows and stops as the subject first realizes the powerless situation.	Time and reality
35c As emotions flowed outwards, time became unbound - freed to resume its normal course.	Time and reality

Level D Analysis
Clusters

Personal Invasion

A possession that the subject valued was vandalized in such a way that it was not as "good" as it was before. This was perceived by the subject as a violation of his space: An area in which he could feel at home - in which he could control his environment and make it to his satisfaction and desires - had been intruded on. An area which the subject regarded as in some sense "supposed to be" under his control (i.e., his property) was changed contrary to his desires.

Repetition

The repetitious nature of this instrusion brought to mind the trouble that the subject would have to go through to restore things to their former state. Further, the repetitious nature of it signalled his inability to do anything to stop this intrusion, and his inability to prevent similar future occurrences. His personal space was in some important sense not his own any more - intrudable-upon. The subject experienced this "intrude-ability" as powerlessness.

Emotional Response

The subject responded to this limiting situation by a bursting outwards to frustration, rage and anger, which poured outwards onto many objects: the vandals, the system, and the They.

Search for Resolution

As alternatives for satisfactory action were perceived as limited, and the subject responded in a bursting out, he also searched for alternative, satisfactory possibilities, in fantasy, physical activity, etc. As he perceived these as unsatisfactory (they did not alter the fact of the "intrude-ability" of his personal space), he again burst outward with rage and anger.

Time and Reality

As the subject perceived these limitations on his space, he became "stuck" in time - it ceased to go forward and stopped, and the world assumed a magical or un-real air (e.g., "This can't really be happening."). As the subject responded emotionally to the situation, the anger bursting outward unbound time and it was freed to follow its course.

Resolution

The force of the bursting outwards, the emotions, abated with time. The subject approached the situation more intellectually, and realized that his initial estimate of the extent of the intrusion - what he would have to do to fix things and make his world "his" again - was exaggerated, and that he could do it easily. The fact of this "intrude-ability" remained, and at some level he still experienced himself as powerless, but without the intense emotional engagement.

These clusters were reflected on, using imaginative variation (varying the situation in my mind) and bracketing as many of my pre-conceptions about powerlessness as possible. They were then integrated, in an attempt to form a cohesive structure of the experience. The result is the E level analysis.

Level E Analysis
Fundamental Situated Description

The subject experienced an intrusion in an area of his world in which he felt he should have (and did have) control. This lack of control was experienced as a sense of powerlessness. His realization of this lack of control was sudden, and it seemed to throw him from his ordinary world (of things going smoothly, as expected) into an unreal, magical world. In this world, it was hard to believe that

the situation had happened, and time seemed to slow down and stop in its course; be became "stuck." The subject responded to this unreal (and yet all too real) intrusion with a bursting out, an outflowing of rage and anger which unbound time and allowed it to flow. As he did so he sought for alternative courses of action which would again allow him to control the situation. As these alternatives proved barren (they did not alter the fact that his world had been intruded on and could again be intruded on), his rage and anger increased. With time the force of the emotions passed; he felt more distant from the situation, and approached it more intellectually. He then realized that the intrusion was not as great as he had first perceived it, and he felt less engaged by his emotions. The fact of the "intrude-ability" still remained, and at some level he still experienced himself as powerless, but without the intense emotional involvement.

Other Data and Results

This section presents other protocols obtained by both me and my students. The analysis (as discussed above) of these is omitted here. However, each protocol, along with its fundamental situated description, is presented.

Protocol 1

Subject: 20 year old female junior psychology major. Protocol introspectively obtained by her.

It's about 8:30 in the morning and I'm just about ready to climb out of bed. The phone rings and I answer it. It is my mother calling long distance from Miami. I immediately sense that something is wrong. She is crying and gets to the point right away. Her brother in Mexico had a cerebral hemorrhage the night before and is now unconscious and paralyzed. Due to complications he's not expected to live, yet it is unknown how soon he will die. By now I am crying and I don't know what to say or do. It all seems so unreal, I just can't accept it. At the same time it all seems so very real that it is bigger than life itself. I take a shower and cry and scream as a release. I feel powerless. The rest of the day I cringe in pain every time I think of my poor uncle. A zombie-like quality has come over my activities; I'm just going through the motions of living. All I feel is a helpless sort of pain. I'm also jumpy for the rest of the day since I know the bad news can arrive at any time. The next morning about the same time I receive another phone call and am told that my uncle has died. I'm glad it's all over. I feel a great loss. I feel helpless, useless. I'm angry; everyone seems to be saying the wrong thing. I feel unanchored in space. My uncle has died and I wasn't even able to do anything about it or help in any way. I feel a definite pull towards Mexico City.

Fundamental Description

The subject's everyday world is suddenly disrupted by the unexpected news of the potential loss of a person who is very important to her. Her not wanting this to happen, and her inability to do anything to help him or prevent it are experienced as powerlessness by the subject. As her everyday world is disrupted, she is thrown into a magical world, one which she does not share with others. They do not understand her world, and she only goes through the motions of living in theirs. In this world, she is caught in the swell of the here and now - the intensity of her emotions, and at the same time she is transported to the there and then - the proximity with her uncle far away. In this world she casts out for alternatives - things she can do to help. Her powerlessness is precisely her perceived lack of possibilities, her inability to actualize viable alternatives. Resolution of the situation, she feels, will come in re-uniting the everyday here and now world (the world of her body) with the magical, there and then world (the world of her thoughts, emotions and desires).

Protocol 2

Subject: 26 year old male fire fighter.

It's about 2:00 in the afternoon and I'm out on my boat with some friends doing some skin diving in the Keys. I've been drinking since this morning and I'm feeling pretty good. When I swim back to the boat I find that it's almost half full of water. Gas tanks, a cooler, a sandwich and a couple of oranges are floating around inside the boat. I get in and start the engine and try to get the boat up on a plane to let the water out. Two girls are with me in the boat and we leave another friend of mine in the water because he would add too much weight to the boat. The weight of the water it too great to allow the boat to get on a plane and as we chug along more and more water comes in over the gunwalls and transom. Finally the motor quits and the boat starts to fill completely with water. One girl is a poor swimmer and she looks like she's about to panic. The other girl remains calm and says that we should all grab our masks and fins because the boat will soon be on the bottom. I am sitting on the bow refusing to believe that this is actually happening to me. I keep saying to the two girls, "Don't worry, it won't sink." I'm not thinking about the danger that we might be in. I'm unable to deal with the situation in any way. I feel strangely detached from what's happening, like an observer. I think the whole thing is somewhat funny. I just keep saying, "It won't sink," until the boat finally settles to the bottom and we are left adrift in the

ocean more than two miles from shore. Now that I'm in the water I'm forced to deal with the situation in order to survive. I now feel I have some control over what happens to me and my friends.

Fundamental Description

The subject is engaged in an enjoyable activity; everything is going along "normally" or "expectedly." The subject finds out that something has gone wrong (water in the boat). There is a possibility that things may get worse and very undesirable consequences - physical danger - may happen (i.e., the boat may sink). The subject explores alternatives for "fixing things," for returning them to the desired state. This method does not work, and the situation becomes worse. There is an air of unreality about the situation (S refuses to believe that it is actually happening). The subject, lacking options for returning the situation to normal, responds by refusing to admit the situation's reality: not considering the danger, "mechanically" comforting companions, feeling like an observer and being detached. This inability to excercise alternatives which will "fix things" is experienced as powerlessness by the subject. As "the worst" happens (the boat sinks) the subject realizes that he does have viable courses of action. "The worst" is not as bad as he fantasized - death is not imminent, and the subject feels in control again - he again has alternatives he can exercise. This resolves the powerlessness for the subject.

Protocol 3

Subject: 27 year old female undergraduate psychology major.

I felt powerless once when my husband got really depressed and I couldn't do anything about it. He sat by himself and would not talk to me. I kept trying to ask him what was wrong, or what I could do to help, but I could not change the situation. I kept trying to think of ways to make the situation change, but no ideas came. Every time I said anything he vetoed it as a possibility. I felt really frustrated! I felt kind of angry because I was not able to control the situation. After the more powerful feelings subsided I got really patient and was able to handle everything well. He worked everything out for himself and I just was there when he needed me to be instead of actively seeking a solution to his problem.

Fundamental Description

A disequilibrium occurred in the everyday world of the subject: Someone close to her was depressed, which the subject experienced as a disruption of her own world. As the subject explored alternatives for restoring the equilibrium and found that they did not work, she

experienced herself as being powerless. The situation was frustrating for the subject; her husband's non-acceptance of her help was responded to with anger. As time passed, these emotions were less present to the subject, and she became comfortable and able to let him work out his own problem. That is, his disruption no longer disrupted her world as well. As he did work things out, the powerlessness resolved.

Protocol 4

Subject: 23 year old female senior zoology major.

It was late spring or early summer and I was wearing a tee shirt and was running around barefoot. My hair was kept short and sloped around my head as my 12 year old friends and I played Man From Uncle. We had taken over two acres of woods that had recently been cut down to start an orchard. I remember feeling a complete sense of freedom as we exchanged character roles and plotted against each other. We ran over mounds of dirt and uprooted trees. I felt my body was mine and I enjoyed myself thoroughly. The game broke up when it got nearer to dinner time. I recall walking home slowly along the road feeling nothing but satisfaction. I walked into our back door and then into the club room where my father was watching TV. I said hello and began to leave the room when he called me back and asked where I had been. I explained flatly what I had been doing which was quite obvious since I was covered with dirt. My father stated that I could no longer spend any time in the woods. He explained that I was becoming a young lady and it was dangerous for me to be in the woods. He said this very firmly and with an edge of righteousness, as if it were his duty. I began to rapidly explain that there was no danger, this spot was in plain sight of the road and I had been with many of my friends. I felt he had not understood and would retract his statement. I was shocked when he again said I would do as he said, and that I could no longer play in any woods. I felt as if my world had fallen apart. I looked at my mother who continued to do what she was doing without a word. I turned and ran up two flights of stairs to my room. I closed my door and began crying. My father had brought me up to revere the woods, it was a special place, and it was a special place to me. I was being banned from the place I loved and my father loved because I was becoming a young lady. I could not conceive of this. Before I had always been allowed to do anything I wanted regardless of my sex. He was also taking the only place I could be myself. My parents were quite restrictive and this was where I felt most free of myself and them. I felt restricted and unjustly convicted and that my father had lost faith in me. And there was nothing I could do to change the rule. It was final. And my mother had backed him up. I cried for some time (20-30 minutes) and I slowly fell asleep in the sun. When I was awakened for dinner the sun was gone. I felt more in control of myself but much emptier than before. This experience really had no resolution; I still fight

the same battles in other ways. Sometimes I win, sometimes I lose. When I win I get that free/full feeling I had in the woods.

Question: How did you feel when you went to your room?
Answer: I don't remember exactly. I was just crying.

Question: Can you say more about feeling more in control but emptier?
Answer: I felt emptier cause I had lost something. I cried and then I felt better.

Question: What about the experience was powerless for you?
Answer: I was powerless because I couldn't regain what I wanted to regain.

Fundamental Description

The subject was engaged in an activity which she loved; which made her feel very free and fulfilled. She was forbidden by her father from engaging in this activity. This refusal was for no reason that she could accept. She was shocked by this refusal and felt as if her world had fallen apart - the structures of her usual, everyday world had fallen apart. Alternatives for regaining control (e.g., her mother) proved fruitless. The subject responded by seeking solitude and crying. The crying seemed to lessen the intensity of her emotions (she felt more in control of herself), but she also felt emptier, as if she had lost something important of herself. She experienced no sense of resolution; however, in similar situations when she does find a way to do what she wants, she feels more in control, more herself.

Protocol 5

Subject: 23 year old female junior psychology major.

When I was 15 years old my mother had forbidden me to participate in co-ed extra curricular activities at school. Her reason for this decision was that public schools did not properly supervise the activities. My reaction to this decision was to feel untrusted, disaffirmed, and socially crippled. The more I considered my limited options, the more powerless I felt. Outright rebellion would be punished severely. This option seemed sure to increase my feelings of hopelessness and helplessness. Talking and negotiating resulted in more feelings of hopelessness and powerlessness since I had nothing to negotiate with. Obedience resulted in my peers' withdrawal of caring and attention towards me since they interpreted my social absence as snobbishness. This compounded my feelings of hopelessness and helplessness since not only did I not have the power to invest

my time as I chose, I also did not have the power to maintain my relationships which were important to me. I contributed to the erosion of my peer relationships by making excuses for my absence at activities rather than stating that I was not permitted to participate. I did this out of fear of becoming even more powerless since I believed that my peers would lose respect for me as a person if they knew how powerless I was in my own family. The option of covert participation was the one which I ultimately chose. I gained and lost personal power from images of self this option induced. I felt powerful when I acknowledged the independence and peer acceptance the choice produced. I felt powerless when I acknowledged the inauthenticity of deceit and the potential risk of being discovered.

The climax of this event took place when my mother discovered that indeed I was at choir practice on Monday afternoons and not at the library. She took off from work and came to my school. There, in front of 125 of my fellow choir members and my choir director with whom I was most enamoured, she pulled me from my seat in the choir and holding my arm tightly announced to all that I had broken God's commandments by lying and failing to honour my mother and father and that for this she ought to "warm my bottom" right there in front of everyone but that this was not a severe enough punishment for the magnitude of my sins. She then chastized me as we left the auditorium. I don't recall anything she said since I was feeling very humiliated and scared that the walk through the auditorium would never end. I really wanted to die. It was the only way I could think of to stop the hurting. I had lost my self respect and the respect of my peers. When I returned home I found I had also lost the support of my father. He had always taken a neutral position with regards to battles that went on between my mother and myself. Now he was siding with her. They both felt I should be punished and needed to confess my sins. At first I was unresponsive to their wishes because of my feelings of hopelessness, helplessness and bereavement. Three days later I was unresponsive because of my feelings of anger, betrayal and disaffirmation.

It was here that my feelings of powerlessness and the event in my life ended for me. In my anger and wish for revenge I realized that I had the trump cards in this escalating power game. In knowing that there were limits to what the law would allow my parents to use as punishment, all I needed to do to regain my power was to commit myself to hold my ground in the face of whatever punishment my parents might inflict which was within the limits of the law. One might say it was a position based on the "You can lead the horse to water but you can't make her confess" philosophy of power plays. And secondly, committing myself to seeking the aid of the law in the event that they used punishments beyond the legal limits. Perceiving the event in this fashion created very intense feelings of powerfulness and self worth which enabled me to feel resolved and okay without my parents approval or cooperation.

Fundamental Description

The subject's being forbidden to engage in activities of her choice by her parents (authorities) meant that she was barred from achieving goals of her choice (peer respect, for example). The subject responded by feeling untrusted and dis-affirmed. She searched for alternative courses of action by which she could do and get what she desired. One alternative (covert participation) was decided on. This option felt both powerful (in her success at reaching goals and independence) and powerless (in her fear of discovery and acting against personal values). The subject felt intensely powerless as she was discovered in her course of action. Negative fantasies came true: She was forced to discontinue the activities and punished for them; and she believed she had lost the respect of her peers and parents. During this discovery, time seemed to slow down and/or stop for her as she felt extremely humiliated and scared. Again, in fantasy, the subject searched for alternatives, even wanting to die (an ultimate alternative for removing herself from the situation). In response to the situation, she first experienced an inward turning-ness (hopelessness, helplessness, bereavement); later, these emotions turned outwards (anger, betrayal). Resolution came with no "external" change in the situation. She realized that she had a viable alternative course of action. In accepting the possibility of negative consequences (parental punishment) and being willing to possibly undergo these consequences, she felt freed to engage in the activities of her choice. The subject realized the limits to the possible negative consequences - the limitations on the power of her parents - and ways to enforce these limitations. She then felt resolved and powerful, not needing help from others.

Protocol 6

Subject: 50 year old female, intermediate school guidance director.

I was really looking forward to my two weeks in Florida. My husband had just left for a three month job in Bahrain, and I was taking what would have been a joint vacation alone. I would be spending the time with our good friends, the Butlers. John met me at the airport and told me that Jean, who had been admitted to the hospital a few days previous, with what was believed a minor ailment, had really had a heart attack, and would be in the hospital during my entire stay. I remember feeling very apprehensive, almost immediately, as I knew this was her second attack. As the days went on, and Jean improved, both John and I were feeling very elated. Then came "Black Tuesday," when she took a very bad turn. It was as I was sitting in the waiting room with her husband, waiting for the doctors to tell us what was happening, that I realized just how powerless I was to stop the chain of events that had started. My good friend was fighting for her life, and I couldn't do a thing to help her. I also had another

problem. John was in a terrible state, and was looking to me for comfort, wanting reassurance that everything would be okay, and my powerlessness grew as I realized that I had to make a decision as to whether to be honest with him with my answers or say what I knew he wanted to hear. I chose honesty, and we both were able to talk about how it felt to be faced with the possibility of losing a loved one. But overriding our entire conversation and tears, was the feeling of frustration we both felt about not being able to do anything to help. At some point during the long hours, I came to grips with the fact that there are many things in our lives that we have no control over at all, so rather than being angry with the lack of control I felt, I just made myself accept the fact that powerlessness can be more destructive in a time of crisis than just accepting situations one is faced with and handling the emotion involved honestly and openly.

Fundamental Description

The subject was initially in a situation of her choice, where she expected to have fun and relax. While in this situation, she found out about a friend's illness. As the friend came near death, S felt powerless as she realized she could do nothing to help the friend get better. S felt angry and frustrated, as well as sad. In talking honestly about these emotions with the friend's husband she found some relief. Resolution came as she made herself accept not being able to do anything to help. Accepting things meant not being angry at fate, and dealing with and expressing the emotions surrounding her friend's situation.

Protocol 7

Subject: 26 year old female psychology graduate student.

When I think back to the time that is the focus for this, I realize it's hard to pin down dates, events, specifics - somehow, it's a little fuzzy in my mind. Maybe that's because it wasn't a clear-cut incident, but a growing chain of happenings - or maybe the fuzziness is the feelings, the bindings. Althought the events are not clear, the feelings are. It started first with a feeling of tiredness - "Here I go, re-writing my dissertation proposal again. What were the things Jim (my chair) said to do? What was wrong with it this time?" I had started going to him in October with an idea - I was interested in women, and in handicapped people. Was there a way I could combine both into a dissertation that I could finish by the end of the year? From there on in, it was downhill. No matter what I came up with, Jim shot it down. "This was too vague, this was too simple, this was too complex, this would take 5 years and 500 people and did I really want that?" Now it was December, and I was no nearer getting started than I had been in October. I was very invested in finishing by June - a potential job could depend on it, and I had

always had the sneaky feeling that if I didn't finish soon, I never would. I could hear my father's voice saying for the years I had been in graduate school, "Remember Don? He (family friend) never finished his dissertation, and it's been 10 years now. He'll never finish - don't let that happen to you."

The December feelings are hard to clarify - I had noticed the tiredness and the frustration mounting since October, but these were different. Suddenly, it seemed, I had no energy. I felt paralyzed, depressed, despairing, stuck in some kind of gluey molasses. Even as I am writing this, I can feel them again. It's almost as though I have no control over my muscles, and they are limp, unresponsive. No matter what I would come up with, Jim would shoot it down, and I would never, ever, ever, ever finish. My father would be furious - and I felt ashamed, guilty - why couldn't I come up with something good enough?

Somewhere in there, I did click that this must be what Marty Seligman's dogs felt like - something I had read about, and used in relation to others, but not to myself. Then I knew that I had to do something to get my control back, but I was too bound up to think about even what I could do.

Finally, a friend of mine who also works with Jim said to me (after hearing me talk) that I needed to tell Jim to stop it, stop being so obsessive, as she knew Jim could do very well. That was the turning point - what I realized that my control was in letting him do this to me, and that it was not entirely my fault - Jim <u>is</u> very picky, and was being hyper about making sure everything was perfectly right or it couldn't fly. I talked to him, we settled on and developed an idea, and I am now progressing on it. I think I will finish by June, which is fine. I also realized that I can get helpless, have felt those feelings since, recognized them and gotten out of them. It's like I take a deep breath, and <u>grab</u> - claw into something and pull it back to me - control, power, whatever.

Fundamental Description

The subject was engaged in attempting to complete a project which was very important to her. At first, she was hopeful of success; however, this success depended on the approval of another person. This approval was not forthcoming. The subject tried repeatedly to gain this approval by altering the project, but it seemed that no matter what she did this approval was not forthcoming; thus, she was frustrated from completing the project. The situation dragged out over months; the extended time period and the repetitive nature of her attempts to attain her goal were very tiring for her. At one point in time, after being in this frustrating situation for some time, things seemed to come to a head. The subject felt paralyzed, depressed, despairing and stuck. It seemed as if she has no energy left. She fantasized that all alternative ways of pleasing the other would prove unsuccessful, and she would be at fault. There was something wrong with her for not being able to succeed at this project. Other negative consequences were present to her: She would disappoint her family and be

a failure in their eyes. She felt too caught up in the situation to be able to rationally consider alternatives - this "being caught up" was one part of the stuckness for her.

A friend suggested another type of alternative: Not to please the other but deal directly with the other's demands. The subject tried this and found that it worked. The stuckness was gone, she could move ahead on the project. The powerlessness had dissipated.

General Data Analysis

In reading the protocols and their analyses, I was struck by both the many similarities and differences that they manifested. The fundamental description would obviously reflect these similarities, and my initial question was what to do with the differences that also showed themselves. One possibility would be to eliminate those parts of the protocols that were different. This seemed unacceptable for many reasons. First, it would eliminate a lot of rich phenomenological data and results on potentially the basis of one experience. Second, it would reduce the eventual result to a "lowest common denominator" type of finding which probably would not be too informative. However, merely listing the differences as differences seemed similarly unacceptable. This would result in a "greatest common multiple," to follow the analogy. Instead, a true phenomenology should look at differences and try to understand them more fundamentally. To the extent that people are experiencing the same phenomenon, they may experience it in different manifestations. Rather than listing these different manifestations or eliminating them, the task should be one of allowing the different manifestations to shed light on the common underlying phenomenon.

Inter-relating with this task was one of deciding the level of analysis that should result. A phenomenological analysis might consist of three sentences describing the central kernal of a

particular experience, or it might detail an experience for many hundreds of pages as does Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of Perception. Obviously, neither of these are "right" or "wrong." Rather, they can be used for different purposes. Our purpose here is to strike an intermediate stance. The reader should be provided, first, with the essential structure of powerlessness. This is its fundamental, existential meaning or significance. Secondly, the phenomenological analysis should provide a description of the experience in its various manifestations. This is a description of the various ways that people live out the experience of powerlessness as it occurs in widely differing situations.

The remainder of this section describes and details certain of my reflections in arriving at the general description of powerlessness. It does so by describing how I thought about the experience (the clusters I broke it down into), detailing each of these themes and referring back to the sample protocols by way of grounding each of them, and detailing certain imaginative variations I made on the phases of the experience.

In examining the various protocols and analyses of powerlessness and transforming them into a general description, I went through two major steps. The first consisted of my reflecting on the general structure that the experiences shared; here, I broke the experience down into clusters or themes. The second step consisted of a more detailed reflection on each of these clusters - the experiences that

went into them (from the protocols) and especially differences in these experiences.

The general structure I thought about consisted of clusters or themes that seemed to run through all the protocols. These were: An initial situation; A change in the initial situation to an out-of-control situation; The realization that no course of action would bring the situation back under control; An emotional response; and, Resolution or non-resolution. This general structure seemed present in each of the protocols I read, although the amount of time the subject spent on each, the way they were experienced, and their order or simultaneity varied somewhat.

Before going into more detail on each of these elements, some thoughts on an important difference and and an important communality in the protocols are in order. One communality among all the protocols I read was that the powerless situation was one which the subject regarded as important to him, rather than trivial. The importance can be seen in the death of the uncle, sickness of the friend, and prohibition from doing activities that the subject regarded as very important. It is less obvious in other protocols: Having a car antenna bent seems somewhat trivial, but the subject regarded it as a significant event. In theory, it seems that trivial events could be recounted as well; perhaps it was the nature of the task presented to the subjects that resulted in events recounted being significant to them. In practise, I realize that in mentally going over several "prevented from" situations which were trivial, I did not experience them as powerless situations. I may have been

disappointed, irritated, or slightly upset, but I did not think of myself as powerless per se. This seems an important point for our discussion: Powerless situations seem to have the characteristic of being somewhat important to the individual concerned. In his own estimation, something has happened which is important to him.

One important difference that I note in the protocols has to do with attribution. Certain of these situations were considered by the subject to be "acts of fate," or of God. This might be seen in the uncle's dying, the friend's illness, or the boat sinking. In other protocols not presented, there were additionally cars out of control, the subject being caught in a rip-tide he was unaware of, and similar situations. Other situations seemed more the result of another person or persons' deliberate action or choice. This can be seen in the protocols of parents' forbidding a child to do something, the car antenna being stolen, or the committee chairman not accepting the dissertation proposal.

Similarly, in certain of the cases, the subject might have prevented the situation from occuring; in other protocols the subject could have done nothing to prevent its occurrence. Thus, if the subject had parked his car elsewhere, the antenna might still be on it; if the other subject had written her proposal differently it might have been accepted. On the other hand, nothing the person could have done would have prevented her uncle's death or prevented the boat from sinking. These two elements, we might suspect, would radically change the way that the person experiences the powerless situation. In examining the protocols, we can see some of these

differences. In the latter situations in which the person could have avoided the situation, there may be an element of self-blaming in the experience. The person may be angry, depressed, etc., over his failure to prevent the situation. Thus, part of the emotionality of the situation may be directed towards the self.

In the former example, the difference in attribution may lead again to a difference in the emotional expressions in the situation. In the protocols, we can see that the subject who had a person or group to blame often directed his feelings directly towards that person or group. Thus, the subject was angry at her parents, the other subject was angry at the car vandals. In the protocols that had to do more with "acts of fate," the subject did not express feelings as directly towards someone. The feelings were there, and certainly in as strong a fashion (e.g., the uncle's death), but in a less directed manner. They came out generally rather than specifically. One caveat in this "directionality" can be seen in imaginatively varying the situation: In situations which are considered to be "acts of God" by religious persons, it is very possible that they will feel angry <u>directly</u> towards that God (e.g., "Lord, why have you forsaken me?" or, as below, the account of a chaplain working with terminally ill children). This again, though, seems to reflect the individual-ness or person-ness of the attributed cause of the situation. In these examples, the entity involved is an individual (human or supernatural) that can be directly dealt with.

In reflecting on the specific emotions expressed, I could come to no conclusions. It did not seem that the person-caused situations

engendered more anger versus depression of vice versa, it did not seem that the intensity, longetivity or resolution of the situation depended on this attribution. In imaginatively varying the situations in my mind, I could think of "fateful" situations in which I would feel as angry for as long, or as depressed and hopeless as intensely, with either attribution. Thus, I remember being on a neurological ward and feeling powerless at seeing patients and feeling very depressed, sad and helpless at this; I have read accounts of chaplains working with terminally ill children and the anger towards God that they feel - its intensity and long lastingness.

Thus, depending on the attributed source of the situation, and the subject's evaluation as to his responsibility in not avoiding the situation, the subject may feel different emotions or feel emotions differently; anger towards himself, or directionality versus directionlessness of emotions. The other structures of the situation (including the initial situation, the out of controlness, the emotional response, search for resolution and resolution) seem to run through the protocols which were "fateful" as well as attributed to deliberate acts of persons, as can be seen in the discussion of the clusters that follows.

Initially, the subject is in a familiar environment in the sense that things are going smoothly. The car is undisturbed, relatives or friends are not sick, the person is allowed to play in the woods or engage in co-ed activities, the boat is working well, etc. In this

sense, things are going well, as expected, in a familiar way. We may say that the subject exists within his or her everyday world - the world of his everyday, commonplace activities and happenings. We may reflect futher on this: This everydayness is not explicitly given in several of the protocols; it is assumed. It is not described at length in most of them. And although the reason for this is probably that what was requested was a description of the powerless situation, we may also understand the everydayness itself as an assumed, taken for granted way of experiencing the world.

Thus, one initial reflection on the powerless situation is that it may be initially experienced as a jarring, a pulling of oneself from this everyday world. We can imaginatively vary this in our mind: Is this jarring a necessary component of powerless experiencing? If I did not take my everyday situation for granted, but knew that (for instance) my husband may get depressed in the future, would I feel more or less powerless? It seems not. When he does get depressed, if there is nothing I can do to ward it off, I will probably still feel powerless in the same way, although obviously not suprised by it. I may have had an opportunity, however, to prepare for this mentally in advance.

In any case, the original everydayness is then disrupted. The subject experiences an event (outside of himself or mental) in which he feels out of control. There is something that he wants to do that he is prevented from doing. Alternatively, it may be something which has happened or will happen which he would wish to prevent but cannot.

Thus, the subject may wish to prevent a husband's depression, a friend's illness or death, or his car being vandalized. He may wish to play in the woods, to continue diving from his boat, to sing in the choir with friends, to get her dissertation though. In these opposite manifestations (having something happen or preventing something from happening) there is an underlying communality of the subject's having his <u>will</u> thwarted. The subject does not "get his way," his will in the matter is thwarted, and what he would like to have happen does not. An obstacle, metaphorically, has appeared in his path.

To continue the metaphor, the subject experiences himself as powerless as he finds no way around this obstacle. He realizes that he has no viable alternatives or options for actualizing his will. Alternative courses of action will lead to unsatisfactory consequences: Either they will not work or they will have other consequences which are unacceptable. The subject may merely realize that no alternatives exist, or he may search for alternatives and find none. Thus, one subject fantasizes finding the vandals of his car and shooting them, another appeals the father's decision to the mother, another tries covert resistance to the mother's prohibition. Alternatively, the subject may realize that there is nothing that can be done about her uncle's death or her dissertation not being accepted. Some of the alternatives sought are realistic (maybe the mother will reverse the father's decision); others are less so and more representative or the living out of the subject's emotions (wanting to shoot an unspecified somebody).

Thus, as the subject realizes that an obstacle exists, and finds no viable way around this obstacle, he perceives himself as powerless. This realization of "no options" may be almost instantaneous (e.g., my uncle died and I know there is nothing I can do) or it may come only after a thematic search for alternatives ("What will mom say?"). As the subject realizes that no alternatives exist he feels powerless. Thus, the powerless feeling may come on suddenly or it may come on gradually, first with an inkling, then as the situation progresses, with a more full blown sense. These differing modes of entering the powerless situation have implications for the emotional quality of the experience (below).

The subjects in the protocols all lived out the powerless situations very emotionally. Their emotions were very strong and present to them, often becoming the figural part of the experience, at least for a time. Certain subjects were angry, enraged or outraged - for instance, the car vandalism or in being forbidden to sing in the choir. Other subjects felt primarily frustrated, for instance, the situations involving the dissertation and the husband's depression. In other situations the subject felt depressed, unworthwhile, hopeless and/or helpless; e.g., the uncle's death or the friend's illness. It is interesting to note that in two of the protocols with "objectively" similar situations - parents forbidding a child to do something - very different emotions were felt. In most of the situations there was a combination of emotions felt by the subject. The dissertation subject felt "tiredness and frustration . . .

paralyzed, depressed, despairing, stuck." The car vandalism subject felt "violated . . . enraged . . . helpless," while the person whose uncle died felt helpless, useless, in pain, etc.

These emotions often have the thrusting out quality which Stevick (1971) associates with anger and rage; alternatively, they may have the pulling inward quality of depression and despair. Certain of the subjects experience both this thrusting outwards and pulling inwards. As described above, the emotions felt did not seem to be determined by the type of situation experienced per se. Thus, I can imagine feeling depressed or angry at the "act of fate" involved in seeing terminally ill children; I can also imagine feeling angry, hopeless, upset, irritated or depressed at being rejected by a girlfriend.

In reflecting further on my own experience, I realize that I now get angry in situations in which I used to feel depressed. I am led to suspect that it is less the type of situation I am present to (since the situations are very similar) and more a function of my particular style of meeting the world. However, I realize that in reflecting this way, I am searching for causes of the experience rather than describing its structure. Bracketing this, I can set it aside as a possible phenomenon for further investigation, and realize it is not part of the fundamental description. We may say, in reflecting on the protocols and their descriptions of the subject's emotionality, that the subjects <u>are</u> experiencing the situations very emotionally; they seem to be caught up in the swell of their emotions, their emotions seem very proximal to them rather than distant (in the

sense of being figural), and these emotions may have the qualities of the thrusting outwards of anger, rage, etc., or the pulling inwards of despair, depression, hopelessness, etc. The subject may, in fact, feel a range of emotions, and feel anger, frustration, despair and depression in response to the situation.

The protocols also indicate that the subjects in the powerless situations experience different parts of their world differently, especially while they are caught in this swell of emotions. Specifically, three parts of the world which may be experienced differently from everyday ways are relations with others, time and believability.

In several protocols there was a theme of feeling isolated, apart from other persons. One characteristic of our everyday world is that it is fundamentally a shared world, that we are Being-in-the-World-with-Others. We apperceive the world similarly, we use similar constructs, we attach many of the same meanings to our experience of our intersubjective world. Similarly, we may experience similar emotions in response to events in the world, or at least understand the differing emotions of our fellows. In the swell of emotions in which subjects experience themselves as powerless, this may change to some degree. Thus, the subject whose uncle died says, "I'm angry, everyone seems to be saying the wrong thing." The girl told that she could no longer play in the woods states that "I felt he had not understood and would retract his statement. I was shocked when he again said I would do as he said. . ." Further, although many protocols did not thematically speak of this, a similar

experience may have been present. In my protocol on the car vandalism, I did not think to describe it, but I remember distinctly that I felt that my friend did not understand what I was feeling - she thought I was feeling things inappropriate or out of proportion, and I did feel very isolated from her. Although seemingly this is not a necessary part of my feeling powerlessness, it does seem that in other situations, if the experience is very important to me and I feel intensely about it, and if other people are present who do not experience themselves as powerless or feel these things, I very often feel isolated from them.

Another aspect of the experience which seems different from the ordinary world is that of believability. In many of the protocols there appears the statement, "I could not believe what had happened," or a variation of it. The car vandalism, the boat sinking, being forbidden to play in the woods, and the uncle's death are examples of this. Subjects said, "It's just so unreal I can't accept it;" "I'm sitting in the bow refusing to believe that this is actually happening to me;" "This couldn't have happened again." This seems another way in which the powerless experience may differ in some instances from ordinary experience. In ordinary experience the world assumes a taken-for-granted aspect. Things are believable to the point of not being thought about quite often. (Naturally, there are other times other than powerless situations where unbelievable things happen, such as when we receive a tremendous gift; it is not only in powerlessness that this unbelievability happens.) In many powerless situations, the world loses its taken-for-granted

characteristic to the point of being unbelievable; the subject cannot accept what has happened at some level. He puts himself at a distance from the experience, from the situation, and in some manner does not accept that it is really happening (while, often at the same time he finds the situation all too real). The subject may experience this as a distancing, a putting of the world at a distance from him. Again in my experience, I recall that as I thought that my car antenna could not have been stolen again, it was as if I were looking at my car through a very long tube, or as if I were watching it on a movie screen, rather than physically being involved with the situation.

A third potential way that the situation may differ from ordinary experience of the world is in the subject's sense of the passage of time. Several subject reported feeling "stuck," as if time has slowed down and stopped. "[I felt] stuck, in some kind of gluey molasses." "I was feeling very humiliated and scared that the walk through the auditorium would never end." "Everything slowed down, and it was as if either I or everything else or both were in molasses - everything flowed very slowly." The protocols which described this "stuckness" also contained the subject's descriptions of their emotions as depressed, humiliated, paralyzed, despairing, etc. As the subjects felt these emotions less intensely, or as the subject felt anger, time seemed flow again. We might say metaphorically that as the subject pulls inward emotionally, he captures time and does not allow it to flow; the passage of time or anger unbind this time and allow it to flow again more freely.

Thus, another part of the subject's phenomenal world is opened up to us. As the subject feels obstacles in his path which cannot be removed or avoided, he feels powerless. He is caught up in the swell of his emotions, and in many ways he leaves the everyday world and enters into another world which is experienced differently. This other world is, first, a world in which emotions are very proximal to the subject. Secondly, his experiences of others, of believability, and/or of time may well be different from his ordinary experience of them. We may metaphorically call this world a "magical," as opposed to an everyday, world. The subject in the powerless situation may enter this magical world in different ways, or to different degrees, which change the fundamental "givens" (e.g., his experience of others or of time), the fundamental experience of "existentials" (Heidegger, 1962).

In the protocols, differing modes of resolution or non-resolution are described. The first of these occurs as the subject regains control over the situation. That which went out of control may come back under control (e.g., the husband ceases to be depressed, the friend could get well again, the committee accept the dissertation proposal), or the subject might find what he considers a viable alternative for potentially getting the situation under control (a "sure fire" way of getting the committee to accept the paper, the subject being in the water after the boat sunk and knowing that he could now swim for shore and save everyone). In one sense, this is the "cleanest," most definite solution; the subject no longer feels a sense of powerlessness and feels back in control of the situation.

In another sense, however, it is less final: When the same situation happens again, the subject will feel similarly powerless unless and until he can again remove the obstacle from his path.

In certain of the other protocols, another resolution is discussed. The situation does not change, but with the passage of time the subject feels less intensely powerless about the situation. We might think of this as a mode of non-resolution. Examples of this are the girl being forbidden to play in the woods, who goes to her room and cried, but never feels resolved about the situation. Alternatively, the woman who has a sick friend felt less involved with the situation after the passage of time, but still at some level felt powerless. Finally, in my situation of the car vandalism, I never regained control of the situation, but after time passed, I felt less intensely about the situation. In all of these (and in other protocols and variations) the subject seems to feel less intensely with time. Both the feelings of powerlessness and the other feelings (anger, hopelessness, etc.) seem to lose their figural quality. They seem to "catch the person up" less. The person may still feel them, and see himself as powerless in the situation, but in a more detached manner. However, the subject may still feel a sense of incompleteness, a "bad taste in his mouth" about the situation. He realizes his former or present powerlessness, although without being as attached and caught up in it.

One other alternative mode of resolution seems to be accepting the situation and one's limitations within it. The closest to this

mode can be seen in the protocol of the woman who was forbidden to engage in co-ed activities. While nothing about the external situation changed, the woman accepted both her limitations and the possibilities of negative sanctions on the part of her parents for her continued activities. In accepting these, and being willing to face and deal with them, she felt more powerful and less powerless in the situation. We may extend this description to one in which the person accepts his limitations and out-of-controlness in the situation, and does not experience this out-of-controlness as powerlessness. This acceptance would be very similar to our acceptance of other bodily and mental limitations on our projects and activities. For instance, we do not normally experience intense powerlessness about our inability to fly or control the rising of the sun. In some sense, we do not expect that we can control, or should want to control these things, and we do not experience ourselves as powerless to do so. Thus, in this mode of resolution, the subject might accept, on a lived level, his facticity (his limitations) within the situation and, while being no less out of control, may not experience this as powerlessness.

In this last mode of resolution, there may be authentic and inauthentic resolution: A person may say to himself, "I should not feel powerless here; I have no right to want to be able to play in the woods," or alternatively, "It is unrealistic to want to prevent my uncle's death." However, the subject may not control his own desires, wants and feelings so easily. On another level, the subject may still desire as intensely to accomplish what he desires, or prevent an occurrence from happening.

General Results

The reflections detailed above are summaries of the process by which I reflected on the protocols analyzed, other protocols and my own experiences of powerlessness. The result was the following description of the experience of powerlessness.

Fundamental Description of Powerlessness

The subject is initially residing and living in his everyday world. This is the world in which events happen normally, things are (more or less) expected, and the subject feels familiar and at-home. This everydayness is disrupted. The subject experiences something in relation to which he is out of control. This may be a project of his which he feels thwarted from accomplishing, or an unwanted event which he cannot prevent from happening. Althought this project or event may vary in its importance, it is usually experienced as something significant to the subject. The event or project may be "internal" or "external," the situation may or may not have been preventable by the subject, and he may attribute the cause of the event to another person(s), to fate or to God. Metaphorically, we may say that an obstacle has materialized in his chosen path.

The subject experiences himself as powerless as he finds no way around this obstacle. He may search for alternative courses of action, or he may merely realize that none exist; thus, the powerless experience may come on suddenly or gradually. In either case, the subject experiences himself as powerless as alternatives prove not viable, as he is faced with unacceptable present realities.

The subject finds himself caught up in the swell of his emotions, especially as the powerless situation is very important and significant to him. These emotions may have the thrusting out quality of anger, rage, etc., or the pulling inwards quality of depression, despair, hopelessness, etc. In the intensity of living these out, the subject may be transported from the everyday world to a "magical" world in which everyday concerns and projects lose their appeal and importance, especially if he is "jarred" out of his everyday world suddenly. In this magical world, the subject rides the swell of his emotions; he may feel isolated from others who are still in the everyday world, experience this magical world as an unreal world

(not believing what has happened to him), and/or experience himself as stuck in time (as if time has stopped and he is not moving in it at all). Different aspects of this magical world seem to become more figural if the subject is originally taken unawares; jarred, as it were, from his everyday world by an important thwarting of his will. Time's stoppage may be experienced especially as the subject pulls inwards emotionally with depression, despair, etc., and it may become unbound and allowed to flow again as emotions are thrust outwards with anger, etc.

The powerless situation may resolve as the subject regains control over his personal space. It may also not achieve resolution, and the subject, with time, experiences increasing distance between himself and the experience: His emotional engagement with the situation lessens. However, the subject still feels a sense of incompleteness, a "bad taste in his mouth" about the situation; a realization of former or present powerlessness although without the emotional attachment. Alternatively, resolution may be achieved as the subject accepts (more or less authentically) his limitations and facticity in the situation and does not experience the still present out-of-controlness as powerlessness. In these three resolutions, the subject (either gradually or suddenly) returns from this magical world to his everyday one, and familiar projects and concerns once more take up their normal importance and significance.

We may take this fundamental description of powerlessness one step further, and transform it into a fundamental structure. In doing this, the primary difference is as follows: The fundamental description explicates the elements which are common to experiences of powerlessness, and does so in a way which presents them in a unified whole. In short, it describes the essential elements of a person's experience of being powerless. In the fundamental structure, a more fundamental essence is sought. The essence of an experience may be thought of as its central meaning or significance. Thus, we may move from a fundamental description to a fundamental structure by asking the questions, "What is the significance of this fundamental description? What is the meaning of powerlessness as so described for the person's life?"

In answering these questions, we may look to other existential analyses of the human condition to build upon for our phenomenology of powerlessness. One such important analysis is the existential analysis of Heidegger. In Being and Time (1962) Heidegger states that Dasein is defined most primordially in terms of its possibility. A tree, for example, always exhibits the qualities of "tree-ness." Likewise, a rabbit always exhibits the qualities of rabbits, and to see one acting like a sparrow would be strange, indeed. Man, however, is unique in that he chooses his possibilities. He chooses who and what he wants to become. That man can choose these possibilities and project himself into them is the essence-tial quality of his as Dasein.

This result of Heidegger's existential analysis is not his alone. There are similar themes as far back as Kierkegaard and Doestoevsky, and it is also stated by Sartre as "Existence precedes essence." For Sartre (1966) this means that while all other entities are defined by their essence (their essence precedes their existence), man chooses who he is to become (his existence precedes his essence).

This analysis is central to the phenomenology of powerlessness. In the fundamental description, it was noted that the experience of powerlessness occurs when a person's will is thwarted: He is not able to accomplish a project of his, or he cannot prevent an unwanted event from happening. The subject finds no ways around obstacles in his path, he is prevented and out-of-control. Insofar as the subject is thwarted in his intended projects, that is, insofar as he experiences himself as powerless, he is prevented from choosing

his projects and possibilities. And insofar as man is essentially defined by this ability to choose his possibilities - who he wishes to become, then in the powerless situation the person is dis-abled from becoming the person who he chooses to be. He is prevented from being Dasein, from being essentially human, in the quintessenal human attribute of being able to choose his projects. We thus arrive at the fundamental significance of the fundamental description of powerlessness above:

Fundamental Structure of Powerlessness

> In the powerless situation, a person experiences himself as losing control over projects of his; certain of his intended acts are thwarted. As projects of the person's are frustrated, he is unable to become the possibilities he has chosen for himself. Insofar as he is unable to project himself into his chosen possibilities, his essential identify as Dasein is dis-affirmed.

Our fundamental structure thus states that the essential significance of the experience of powerlessness is that it constitutes a dis-affirmation of the person in his central identity. This dis-affirmation may or may not be experienced thematically. The dis-affirmation is the existential significance of powerlessness - its essential structure and meaning. It is not necessarily another experience in itself. The dis-affirmation is exactly the inability to be human in the sense of being Dasein. It is not necessarily another experience caused by, causing or concomitant to the experience of powerlessness.

When the dis-affirmation is experienced, it may be experienced thematically, or partially to totally pre-reflectively. When it is thematic, the subject might feel a sense of low self-esteem, low self-worth, etc. Alternatively, it may be present to him in a more diffuse way. One example of this would be Frankl's (1973) description of "existential neurosis;" a person realizes at some level that his life is taking on a flat, meaningless quality. Frankl analyses this in terms of inauthentic living. A person in this state is not choosing his possibilities, but rather identifying himself with societal roles, family roles, etc. Heidegger (1962) and Sartre (1966) make similar analyses of inauthentic living, describing it as a type of awareness that "something is wrong," but being unable to thematize exactly what is problematic.

CHAPTER V
FACTOR ANALYTIC RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the factor analytic study. Several different solutions were obtained in analysing the data; the important ones are reproduced here. Because of the dual nature of this investigation, the factor analytic results are separated from discussions of their methodology (and later, their interpretations) by the phenomenological presentations. For this reason, it might be helpful in this introduction to review the different treatments of the data that will be examined below.

First, the situations are presented classified by type. This was done by examining the short description of the situation on each questionnaire and establishing categories. This gives the reader an idea of what type of powerlessness subjects are referring to. After this, the data are taken as a whole and factor analyzed, with the results presented. First, the unrotated solution is presented, and then the rotated solution. Two other analyses are then presented, with a view towards establishing that the factors obtained are, at least mathematically, the correct ones. In these two analyses, first the data are analyzed omitting the dummy items, and second the data (with dummy items) are analyzed using a higher Eigenvalue cut-off (reducing the number of factors retained in the solution).

It was suggested that there might be a possible difference in the way men and women experienced being powerless. To test this, the analysis was run on males and females separately and results then presented. Further, it has been suggested that possibly "powerlessness" is not a unitary phenomenon - that different situations might have different powerless experiences associated with them. Further, it is suggested that the phenomenological results may apply more to one type of powerlessness than to all. To test this, the situations are broken down into physical and other situations and separate analyses presented.

Two initial notes can be made on the presentation of data. First, in the initial analysis (unrotated and rotated), the factor names are presented, followed by a listing of each item loading on each factor. For the following analyses, this is not done. Factor names alone are presented and any unclear factors are noted and individual items listed, in order to save the reader a long, repititious excursion into lists of items. Second, items were considered to load on a given factor when their scores were greater than 0.30 (or -0.30), and were also listed in brackets when they were greater than 0.27. The figure of 0.30 is chosen first out of convention, and secondly because it produced factors which were conceptually sensible. The 0.27 figure was chosen because it added approximately 5 items throughout the factors, all of which conceptually would be thought to load on those factors. For the reader's information, items loading on factors which are not listed in the text are found in Appendix 4.

Classification of Situations

Subjects were asked, before completing the questionnaires, to write down one or two sentences describing the experience. These short descriptions were examined and classified into groups, which are listed below for the reader's information.

	number
Unpreventable negative occurrences in relationships (deaths of friends or relatives; breaking up with lovers)	29
Something negative happening to a friend or relative (includes pets, animals)	20
Authority figures or parents telling the subject what to do (includes army experiences)	14
Being arrested, going to trial	13
Physical danger (including many instances of almost drowning)	12
Dealing with bureaucracies	12
Car wrecks	11
Being sick or disabled	10
Being physically unable to do something (e.g., car stalling out in the country)	6
Being dependent on another's decisions before the subject can do something he/she desires	4
Family fights	4
Other or known	59
Total	194

Factor Analysis of all Subjects

Factor Analysis Including all Items

The first analysis was run with all 194 subjects and using all responses to the questionnaire (including dummy items). The first analysis was unrotated. With a cut-off Eigenvalue of 1.0, 13 factors were retained. This gave a cumulative share of accounted for variance of 66%. The items loading on each factor, the factor name, and the values associated with the loading of each item are given below. A cut-off point for items loading of 0.30 was chosen; however, items are included in brackets which scored over 0.27; similarly, items which loaded significantly but negatively on the factor are noted.

TABLE 1
Unrotated Factor Analysis of all Data

Factor 1: General Factor of Powerlessness (30% of variance)

alone	-0.44	unsupported	-0.51
angry	-0.48	useless	-0.53
depressed	-0.58	worthless	-0.55
despairing	-0.59	caught up in emotions	-0.45
dis-affirmed	-0.47	not able to be self	-0.44
enraged	-0.48	unacceptable situation	-0.56
good for nothing	-0.45	no alternatives	-0.36
hopeless	-0.60	not understood by others	-0.38
hostile	-0.50	different goals than usual	-0.37
insecure	-0.42		
irritated	-0.43	(opposites)	
isolated	-0.49	adventurous	0.43
not understood	-0.41	enthusiastic	0.37
out of control	-0.41	self confident	0.44
sad	-0.50	versatile	0.31
solitary	-0.36		

Factor 2: Dummy Items (14% of variance)

adventurous	-0.43	not understood	-0.32
enthusiastic	-0.52	self confident	-0.43
imaginative	-0.62	tolerant	-0.32
impulsive	-0.54	versatile	-0.60
ingenious	-0.58	thwarted	-0.30
liesurely	-0.32	time passing fast	-0.41

Factor 3: Angry/Mobile (7% of variance)

angry	0.58	looked for ways out	0.39
enraged	0.63	(opposites)	
hostile	0.58	isolated	-0.31
irritated	0.58	insecure	-0.42

Factor 4: Dis-affirmed by Valued Others (7% of variance)

good for nothing	0.48	(opposites)	
tolerant	0.34	time passing fast	-0.43
useless	0.31	isolated	-0.34
worthless	0.40		
time passing slow	0.31		

Factor 5: Stuck (7% of variance)

time passing slow	-0.64	(opposites)	
no alternatives	-0.38	time passing fast	0.45
could not prevent	-0.30	worthless	0.37

Factor 6: Depressed (6% of variance)

significant event	-0.42	(caught up in situation)	-0.27
depressed	-0.39	(opposites)	
sad	-0.43	unsupported	0.32
time passing fast	-0.34		
(despairing)	-0.29		

Factor 7: Alone (5% of variance)

alone	0.41	(opposite)	
solitary	0.35	looked for ways out	-0.32
isolated	0.30		

Factors 8 through 13 had either 1 item (numbers 9, 10, 12) or no items (numbers 11, 13) significantly loading on them. They accounted for no more than 3% of the variance each, and so are eliminated from consideration. The factor analysis of all data was performed once again using the varimax rotation. The results appear below:

TABLE 2
Rotated Factor Analysis of all Data

Factor 1: Alone/Insecure			
alone	-0.67	insecure	-0.40
isolated	-0.80	unsupported	-0.42
hopeless	-0.45	(not able to be self)	-0.28
solitary	-0.67	(dis-affirmed)	-0.27
Factor 2: Dummy Items (8)			
adventurous	0.33	ingenious	0.68
enthusiastic	0.44	(liesurely)	0.24
imaginative	0.68	self confident	0.56
impulsive	0.47	versatile	0.60
Factor 3: Angry/Mobile			
angry	0.85	irritated	0.74
enraged	0.80	looked for ways out	0.33
hostile	0.79	(unacceptable situation)	0.29
Factor 4: Dis-affirmed			
dis-affirmed	-0.30	insecure	-0.32
good for nothing	-0.70	useless	-0.71
hopeless	-0.34	worthless	-0.87
Factor 5: Time Perception			
time passing slow	-0.78	time passing fast	0.84
Factor 6: Depressed			
depressed	0.74	caught up in emotions	0.37
despairing	0.64		
sad	0.61	(opposite) adventurous	-0.31

TABLE 2 - continued

Factor 7: Disruptive of Normal Life

disruptive	-0.39	not understood	-0.35
not able to be self	-0.37	looked for ways out	-0.53
unacceptable situation	-0.35	different goals than normal	-0.55

Factors 8 through 13 were not listed for reasons similar to those above: They had few items loading on them, and conceptually either repeated earlier factors or did not make sense. The following table contrasts results of the two unrotated and rotated factor analyses:

TABLE 3
Unrotated and Rotated Factor Names

Unrotated	Rotated
General Factor of Powerlessness	Alone/Insecure
Dummy Items	Dummy Items
Angry/Mobile	Angry/Mobile
Dis-affirmed	Dis-affirmed
Stuck/Time Perception	Time Perception
Depressed	Depressed
Alone	Disruptive of Normal Life
Stuck	

Factor Analysis without Dummy Items

A second set of factor analyses was run (both rotated and unrotated). These solutions factor analyzed only the items which were hypothothesized to load on factors pertaining to powerlessness. Thus, the 12 items which were from the lability scale of the Multiple Affect Adjective Checklist were eliminated and the analysis run on the remaining 33 items. Ten factors were retained in this analysis (using the cut-off criterion of Eigenvalue = 1.0), accounting for 64% of the

variance. A summary of the factors obtained using this method is given below, contrasted with the factors obtained using all 45 items.

TABLE 4
Unrotated Factor Names: Including and not Including Dummy Items

Not Including Dummy Items	Including Dummy Items
General Factor of Powerlessness	General Factor of Powerlessness
. . . . .	Dummy Items
Angry/Mobile	Angry/Mobile
Dis-affirmed	Dis-affirmed
. . . . .	Stuck
Depressed	Depressed
Alone	Alone

In the unrotated solution, there were 5 factors which conceptually made sense. The sixth factor included words (e.g., reflective) which many students had not understood, plus two items which had been considered dummy items but retained in this solution. Factors 7 through 10 consisted of 1 item each and accounted for 3 to 4% of the variance each. It is noted that the "stuck" factor did not appear in the solution including dummy items. (See Appendix 4)

TABLE 5
Rotated Factor Names: Including and not Including Dummy Items

Not Including Dummy Items	Including Dummy Items
Alone/Insecure	Alone/Insecure
. . . . .	Dummy Items
Angry/Mobile	Angry/Mobile
Dis-affirmed	Dis-affirmed
. . . . .	Time Perception
Depressed	Depressed
Stuck	Disruptive of Normal Life
(2 dummy items)	
Search for Alternatives (?)	

Again, it can be seen that the first factors correspond in these two solutions. The last factors tended to differ somewhat. The final factor in the new solution - "search for alternatives" - is unclear, containing the following questionnaire items: disaffirmed (0.33); (out of control) (0.27); unsupported (0.33); looked for ways out (0.62); and different goals (0.31).

Factor Analysis with High Eigenvalues

The factor analysis produced 45 factors. Using the standard default option, the cut-off after which factors were not longer considered was chosen as 1.0. This produced 13 factors before cut-off. On examining the results, it was noted that after approximately 7 factors, others no longer had the conceptual sense to them that the first 7 did; moreover, the share of variance accounted for by them was less than 3.2% each. In allowing further factors (numbers 8 through 13) to be retained, some variance was being lost - the amount of variance which these factors account for is not loading onto the first 7 factors. It was felt that by raising the cut off to a higher Eigenvalue, possibly stronger loadings on the main factors could be obtained. Thus, the analyses were performed again using Eigenvalue = 1.5; producing an approximate accounted for share of variance of 50%.

TABLE 6

Unrotated Factor Names - High and Low Eigenvalues

High Eigenvalue (1.5)	Low Eigenvalue (1.0)
General Factor of Powerlessness	General Factor of Powerlessness
Dummy Items	Dummy Items
Angry/Mobile	Angry/Mobile

TABLE 6 - continued

High Eigenvalue	Low Eigenvalue
Dis-affirmed (tolerant, time passing slow)	Dis-affirmed
Dis-affirmed (time passing fast)	Stuck
Depressed/Good Feelings Towards Others	Depressed
Alone	Alone

Differences can be seen more clearly by examining selected factor loadings. (Refer to Appendix 4 for complete listing.)

TABLE 7
Selected Unrotated Factor Loadings:
Low and High Eigenvalues

Factor 4: Dis-affirmed (low)	Factor 4: Dis-affirmed (high)
Good for nothing	Good for nothing
Tolerant	Tolerant
Useless	Useless
Worthless	Worthless
Time passing slow	Time passing slow
(opposites)	(opposites)
Isolated	Isolated
Time passing fast	Time passing fast

Factor 5: Disaffirmed (high)	Factor 6: Depressed/Good Feelings Towards Others (high)
Good for nothing	Unreal
Worthless	Depressed
Time passing fast	Forgiving
(opposites)	Sad
Time passing Slow	Caught up in emotions
No alternatives	(opposite)
	Unsupported

The rotated factors are similarly presented for high and low Eigenvalue solutions:

TABLE 8
Selected Rotated Factor Loadings:
Low and High Eigenvalues

High Eigenvalue (1.5)	Low Eigenvalue (1.0)
Alone/Insecure	Alone/Insecure
Dummy Items	Dummy Items
Angry/Mobile/Unsupported	Angry/Mobile
Dis-affirmed/Depressed	Dis-affirmed
Time Perception	Time Perception
Depressed/Mobile	Depressed
Disrupted/Prevented/Depressed	Disruptive of Normal Life

Factor Analysis by Sex

For the factor analysis of the 88 males, 14 factors were retained using Eigenvalues greater than 1.0. This accounted for 73% of the variance. The unrotated solution gave results which did not seem conceptually sound. Factor 1 was again the general powerlessness factor (very similar to the same factor using all subjects). Factor 2, however, included both most of the dummy items and others such as: alone, isolated, insecure, disruptive, solitary and not understood. It thus seemed a combination of the dummy factor and the alone/insecure factor. The second factor, moreover, listed as significant but opposite many of the angry/mobile items. The third factor did the opposite. Again, it listed the dummy items, but this time also listed the synonyms for angry; items such as isolated and solitary were significant but opposite. (See Appendix 4 for complete listings.)

It is presumed that the low number (n = 88) is responsible for this, and the rotated solution was then taken as more representative of the actual factors involved.

Similar findings were present in the analysis of female subjects taken by themselves. The first factor (the general factor) was the same, but there was confusion between the dummy items and other factors. This stands in opposition to the marked clarity with which dummy items factored out in other solutions. Again, the rotated solution is taken

as more representative, and the factor names for males and females are presented below.

TABLE 9
Rotated Factor Names:
Males, Females and All Subjects

Males	Females	All
Alone/Insecure	Alone/Insecure	Alone/Insecure
Dummies (12)	Dummies (6)	Dummies (8)
Angry	Angry/Unsupported	Angry/Mobile
Dis-affirmed/Depressed	Depressed	Dis-affirmed
Time Perception	Time Perception	Time Perception
Disruption of Normal Life	Search for Alternatives	Depressed
Depressed/Thwarted	Dis-affirmed	Disruption of Normal Life

It may also be noted that other factors can be named for males and females. For males, Factor 8 is Dis-affirmed/Unsupported; Factor 10 is again Dis-affirmed/Depressed; and other factors repeat selected dummy items. For females, Factor 9 is Out of Control; Factor 10 combines Dis-affirmed, Depressed and Out of Control; Factor 11 is Disruption of Normal Live; and other factors repeat dummy items.

Factor Analysis by Situation

The factor analysis was performed again after dividing the questionnaires into two groups: those who experienced a physical powerlessness (e.g., almost drowning, being physically restrained, etc.), and those whose powerlessness was not purely physical. (A third group was not factored, including subjects who did not put down anything and subjects whose description was ambiguous.) The physical group had 39 observations, the other group had 118. As the number of observations was exceeded by the number of items in the physical group (and especially since one should have at least six subjects per item) these data cannot be relied on. They are put into the following table with the other data for interest. (See Appendix 4 for items.)

TABLE 10
Rotated Factor Names by Situation

Other	Physical	All
Alone/Insecure	Angry/Prevented	Alone/Insecure
Dummy Items	Not Understood*	Dummy Items
Angry/Misunderstood	Depressed/Insecure	Angry/Mobile
Depressed	Time Perception	Dis-affirmed
Dis-affirmed	Dummy Items	Time Perception
Time Perception	Dis-affirmed	Depressed
Out of Control	Alone/Unsupported	Disruption of Normal Life
Disruption of Normal Life		

* This factor was actually a combination: Not Understood/Alone/Thwarted/Hopeless.

Test Retest Reliability

To calculate test retest reliability, 22 subjects were given the questionnaire twice, with 14 days between administrations. Using the standard method for calculating test retest reliability, items which loaded on the same factor were selected and their scores added up to give each subject one score for each administration of the test.

Specifically, items which loaded onto Factor 1 after rotation were selected, including: Alone, Solitary, Hopeless, Isolated, Insecure, and Unsupported. A correlation coefficient was then calculated for the two sets of 22 scores. As the data were ordinal, this was a Spearman correlation coefficient. The correlation was $r = 0.61$, which was significant at the 0.0025 level.

CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The preceding pages have introduced the concept of powerlessness, and demonstrated two very different methodologies for obtaining more information about it. In this chapter each of these results - the phenomenological and factor analytic - will first be discussed separately. In these discussions the meanings and implications of them will be fleshed out somewhat as they stand alone. However, as they do not stand alone, but interact with one another, the bulk of this discussion was pertain to this interaction.

First, the phenomenological results will be discussed. Implications of the phenomenological structure of powerlessness for a possible structure of power will be suggested, and the relation of these results to others found in the literature will be discussed. The factor analytic results are then examined. Rationales for many of the procedures are stated, as well as for certain of the decisions regarding the interpretation of factors. The factors are then interpreted, and a factor structure of powerlessness presented. Validity and reliability are discussed, along with the results of the analyses of subsets of the data. The results are then discussed in light of each other; ways in which the factor analytic results add to an inform the phenomenological findings and vice versa are described, and suggestions for further study made.

Phenomenological Results

By the very nature of the phenomenological study, a discussion of its results must take a different shape than the usual discussion section of a similar empirical study. In the discussion section, the meaning of the results is usually examined; in the phenomenological study, these meanings were the results themselves, and the preceding reflections which were detailed fleshed out these meanings. It is possible, before going on to consider the factor analytic results, to relate the phenomenological analysis of powerlessness in two areas: (1) Some preliminary comments may be made on implications of the phenomenology of powerlessness for a structure of power; and (2) The relation of this analysis to the literature discussed in Chapter II may be briefly examined.

Powerlessness and Power

In reviewing the phenomenological analysis of powerlessness, we note that one central point in the fundamental description was that when one is powerless, he is prevented in some way. He is out of control with respect to something. (Caveats will be discussed below: It is suggested that this analysis is more appropriate to certain situations than others; we shall weaken the statement here and state that this seems central in certain situations of powerlessness.) The important point is the it was exactly this personal out-of-controlness that

led to the conclusion, in the fundamental structure, that the fundamental meaning of powerlessness was that of dis-affirmation. Using this same reasoning, we can make some suggestions about directions in which to look for possible meanings of the experience of power.

In looking at power, we notice that the root of the word comes from the latin potēre, meaning "to be able" (Winter, 1973, p. 5). Elements of this appear in many definitions in the literature. Russell (1938) defines it as the production of intended effects, McClelland (1975) and Winter (1973) define it in terms of a person's effect on outcomes, and similar strains appear in the works of Adler (1927), Sampson (1965), Sorokin and Lunden (1959), Minton (1967) and others. Thus, without doing a formal analysis, it is possible to suggest with a certain degree of believability that power incorporates having intended projects which we are <u>able</u> to accomplish. Of course, this statement leaves many (if not most) questions about the structure of the experience unanswered: Does one experience power when accomplishing old tasks one assumes he can accomplish (e.g., tying one's shoes), or is it only new tasks? In either case, the element of being-able seems common to experiences and definitions of power. If we may take this being-able as in some way fundamental, then by a similar extension of Heidegger's analysis, the existential meaning of the experience of power would reveal itself as follows:

> In a powerful situation, a person has control or gains control over a part of his life: He is able to accomplish or becomes able to accomplish certain intended projects. Insofar as he is able to project himself into his chosen possibilities - to do or be what he wishes - his essential identity as Dasein (as that which can choose what it wishes to become) is affirmed.

At the risk of being repititious, it should be stressed that this structure is tentative. It appears to be a well grounded hypothesis, deriving from a communality in the definition of power and the thoughts of most writers on it, then utilizing the same analysis as before. However, it remains a hypothesis: an area in which further investigation would be useful to confirm, extend or modify this structure.

Powerlessness and Other Literature

With the initial phenomenological structure of powerlessness (and our hypothesized essence of power), it is now possible to re-examine the previous literature on these phenomena and note their relation to the present results. Hopefully, the phenomenology of powerlessness will not diametrically oppose previous work, nor should it duplicate it exactly. Rather, it should add to and deepen the understandings of power and powerlessness that have been achieved using other methodologies by grounding them more fundamentally in the experience itself and its essential structure.

Before commencing, however, two things should be noted. First, the fundamental description of powerlessness is not as pertinent to these works as is the fundamental structure. In the literature, powerless experiencing is not described, but defined, and conclusions built from that definition. Thus, it is the essential structure of powerlessness that is related. Second, as has been previously stated, most writers do not write on powerlessness, but rather on power. If powerlessness is considered, it is as the antithesis of power. Thus,

in relating the present investigation to the context of previous ones, it is necessary to relate not only the findings on powerlessness, but also the hypothesized structure of power. This is not done from any over-confidence in this tentative structure, but rather from the necessity of speaking to the tendency in literature to concentrate on power rather than powerlessness.

Taking first the three existential analyses of power and powerlessness discussed above, we would expect the greatest agreement between these results and our present ones. In fact, as we look at our general structure and the essences of the phenomena which these writers obtained, we see close similarities. Neitzsche's Will to Power was summarized above as an existential statement of "I choose" in the face of external sources of value which are breaking down in society at large. Tillich describes Neitzsche's work as a dynamic self affirmation of life, while May described it as self realization and self actualization (Chapter II). Tillich's own definition of power is the possibility of self-affirmation in spite of internal and external negation, and is unified with love; love is seen as the reunion of the separated, which is the power of being in the face of its negation. Both Neitzsche's and Tillich's analyses seem very close to our hypothesized structure of power. We have characterized power as the fundamental ability to throw oneself into one's chosen possibilities, and thus fundamentally affirming one in his possibility. This is similar to Tillich's self affirmation (although Tillich does not detail exactly how or why power is self-affirming)

and to Neitzsche's fundamental "I choose" although he does not specify the effect of the "I choose" on the person. Thus, the essential structure of power seems very close or identical in Tillich, Nietzsche and the present work; the different being one of emphasis. Where Neitzsche is concerned with values, and Tillich with the ontology of Being, I have concentrated on the phenomenologies of power and powerlessness per se.

May's structure of power and powerlessness are given less explicitly. However, these same ideas may be seen in his work. He states that there are five "levels of power," a power to be, a need for self-affirmation, a need for assertion, an aggressive stage and a violent stage. The organism is powerless, according to May, insofar as he cannot affirm himself or get that affirmation from another, insofar as he cannot be and get his fundamental needs met in interaction with his environment. His central thesis, in exploring the causes of violence, is that this type of powerlessness leads eventually to violence unless the person gains a measure of power. Thus, in May we again see this same essential theme - powerlessness as a lack of self-affirmation.

An important question to ask, then, is the following: If the essences of power and powerlessness agree substantively with the previous analyses of May, Tillich and Neitzsche, are they offering any new knowledge? What is their purpose except as a replication? Even in these writings and analyses, the essences of power and powerlessness are presented as givens, for the reader to accept or reject. No explanation of the manner in which results were obtained is presented.

Their rationale, and the supporting phenomenological analyses (much less any empirical demonstration), have not been presented. Additionally, each of these analyses was presented from within a context of another project or purpose: a study of values, fundamental ontology and the sources of violence. Thus, the analyses of power and powerlessness were presented as they threw light on these concerns. Finally, this analysis of powerlessness is in some ways more complete than previous works. It includes a fundamental description of the phenomenon in addition to the essential structure which is useful for clinical applications or research. It also provides the link between the fundamental description (as thwartedness) and the structure (as fundamental negation of Dasein in his possibilities). While the other three analyses stress certain elements of this, and agree with the analysis, they do not constitute a unified presentation of it.

In a different realm, the phenomenology of powerlessness fits in well with the understanding of powerlessness as learned helplessness. Seligman's definition of helplessness - outcome occurring independently of any possible response - is not very different (although much more elegantly simple) to our fundamental description of thwartedness or inability. Seligman describes helplessness as causing anxiety, depression or even death. While, in describing it within a different context, we would not use the causal terminology, there is certainly an agreement that helplessness or powerlessness involves anxiety and/or

depression. Further, certain of Seligman's experiments make even more sense when the phenomenological fundamental structure is considered. Seligman describes rats which are made helpless, and how they die more quickly and without the struggle of wild rats. He speculates about accounts of prisoner's deaths in prisoner of war camps as similar to this - the prisoner just gives up. Insofar as this prisoner is powerless, and insofar as this powerlessness is of a very fundamental nature, the prisoner is fundamentally dis-affirmed; his death and giving up is understandable. As the prisoner is made more helpless and his choices are taken away, he loses that which makes him himself. It is also interesting to note Frankl's (1973) work in this connection. In reflecting on his death camp experiences, Frankl concludes that those prisoners who were able to find other meanings in their life - found something to live for - were the ones who survived. The others did not. Again, these people in their powerlessness needed to find sources of self-affirmation and meaning in their lives, or else they died. The powerlessness of that situation was dis-affirming to them in an essential way.

A similar relationship exists between the hypothesized essential meaning of power and several of the other writings on the nature of power. Many of these writings have as a communality the description of man's striving for power. Included among these are Russell, Adler, Sampson, McClelland, and Winter, and the writers on Social and Political power such as Berle and Lasswell. Our tentative structure of power

again helps us to understand this striving for power, as described by these men, as again a dynamic self affirmation of life. In attempting to relate the phenomenological understanding of the phenomenon to other writings, we may attempt to re-interpret them more fundamentally. We may tentatively, then, interpret the "craving for superiority," or the "imposition of one's will on another" described by Adler and Russell, as being grounded in the attempt to express one's will, become one's chosen possibilities, and affirm oneself in this becoming. Thus, rather than seeing superiority or naked force as instincts or inherent urges, we can see them more fundamentally as manifestations of man's striving to be. This understanding can also be useful in dialogue between the positions writers take on, for example, the relation between power and love. Russell, Adler, Sampson and many other writers see power as antithetical to love, whereas Tillich explores their unity. How can this be? In looking at Russell, we see that his initial definition of power was the production of intended effects. From within the context that Russell was thinking, these intended effects involved the domination of one man over another, the imposition of one's will on another. The existential analyses, however, were focused slightly differently, on the production of one's intended effects (by and large) over his own world - his own self. The phenomenological understanding of power as self-affirmation in achieving projects can lead us to questions which go beyond these analyses: How is it that projects certain men have involve their imposing their will against another's, whereas Tillich and May describe

other senses of power in achieving personal projects? Does the answer lie in May's description of powerlessness as leading to aggression and then to violence, or in Adler's description of the inferior world of the infant? If the striving for superiority is a manifestation of the striving for being, can this striving be made to manifest itself in ways other than ones involving another person being powerless? This study, naturally, does not begin to answer these questions. It does suggest, however, that there are similarities in the various descriptions of power as love as as antithetical to love, which depend on the context and the view of man one holds. It suggests that the striving for superiority over another person, the antithetical nature of love and power, may be one manifestation of power as self-affirmation.

The present work, then, adds to, grounds more fundamentally, and in some ways goes beyond much of the traditional work on power and powerlessness. It is in basic agreement with the traditional analysis of powerlessness, which is similar to our fundamental description. While a formal fundamental description of power was not achieved, the direction it might take seems very close to the definitions of Russell, Adler, etc. The fundamental structure, underlying the fundamental description, both makes some results (such as Seligman's) more understandable, while raising further questions about others. It helps us to put into their proper context the works of the philosophers and psychologists of power, to see the particular type and manifestation of power that they considered, and to question what other types of power might be possible.

Factor Analytic Results

Generally, the way that the analysis of data was performed was that a multiple factor analysis of the entire data set (194 subjects, 45 items) was performed. This analysis was presented unrotated, and rotated using the varimax program (an orthogonal rotation). These solutions provided the bulk of the data to provide a factor analytic interpretation of the structure of powerlessness. In order to further analyze the data, the entire set was also analyzed with a higher Eigenvalue cut-off (1.5 rather than 1.0) to give a greater loading on the higher order factors. Further, another solution was shown in which the dummy items were eliminated before the set was analyzed. These give alternate solutions which, in effect, ehck the first ones. The data were then broken down in two other ways: by sex and by situation, and analyses performed on each. This section will give certain of the rationales for decisions, speak to the issues of validity and reliability, discuss the interpretations of results, and the differences obtained when breaking down the data by sex and situation.

Rationales

The first analysis gave both rotated and unrotated solutions for the data. The unrotated factors gave a very clear breakdown of the

data into conceptually expected and clear factors. The rotated solution again gave clear factors; however, there were two main differences in the results. First, whereas a general factor was obtained in the unrotated solution, this became an "alone" factor in the rotated solution (this factor appeared as a lower order factor in the unrotated solution). Second, the factor of "stuckness" appeared in the unrotated factor analysis, whereas it did not appear in after rotation.

It was decided that the unrotated solution provided the more useful interpretation of the data. In both solutions, the factors were very "clean" - items loading on the factors did so over the 0.30 level almost without exception; further, no "unaccountable" items loaded on unrotated factors that did not also load on the rotated factors. In the unrotated solution, the factors came out almost exactly as predicted - in fact the rotated factors added nothing to the correlation between predicted and achieved factors. In the varimax rotation (an orthogonal rotation) the axes of rotation are changed to maximize the difference in the two vectors. If the axes are already distinct and separate (which was the case since clear factor structures were obtained), then rotating the factor structure may have "pulled apart" already existing factors and could give spurious interpretations to the data.

Since both solution, then, were conceptually and mathematically clear, the one which gave more heuristic value to the data was chosen. For this reason, in interpreting the factor analysis of the whole data

set, the unrotated solution is utilized. When comparing the data to subsets of it (e.g., subjects divided by sex) the rotated solution is used. This is because in dividing the data, the number of subjects sometimes went close to (and once definitely below) the minimum acceptable number of subjects. The factors (as expected) were in fact not conceptually clear in the unrotated solutions in these cases (factors were repeated, dummy items appeared in other factors). After rotation, these factors did attain a greater degree of interpretability.

Parenthetically, this gives a sort of negative or back-door evidence for the validity of the unrotated interpretations. The factors were clear in the case of 194 subjects, and lost that clarity when the subject pool was reduced to 88 male subjects.

The mathematical validity of the factors was checked in several ways. One of these (as discussed above) was to examine both unrotated and rotated solutions. Two others were to re-analyze the data, eliminating the dummy items from it, and to re-analyze the data using a higher Eigenvalue cut-off. Removing the dummy items was hypothesized to leave the factor structure basically intact (except, of course, that the second factor would not appear). As the dummy items do account for some finite amount of variance on other factors, it was also hypothesized that there should be some small effects, especially to lower order factors. These effects would be the result of the missing variance from the dummy items not being able to load on other factors, and also of the missing share of variance of Factor 2, which would increase variance accounted for by other factors.

In fact, the only difference in the two solutions was that when the dummy items were not included, Factor 5 (Stuck) did not appear. As this factor seemed to somewhat mysteriously appear, change places and vanish entirely in different solutions, it was concluded that its existence was somewhat ephemeral at best.

The data were also analysed using an Eigenvalue of 1.5 rather than 1.0 (as is customary). In this solution, it was hypothesized that no significant changes should occur. In the lower order factors there might be a mathematical effect (again) of having the share of variance accounted for increased. The results were as expected; the major factors remained constant. The factor of stuckness again disappeared, and another factor appeared (disaffirmed II) that seemed to make little conceptual sense. (This was Factor 5, accounting for 8% of the variance.)

In summary, the multiple analyses of all subjects' data led to the conclusions that: (1) The unrotated factors were of the most heuristic value in interpreting the structure of powerlessness; (2) There was no significant difference aside from the difference in Factor 1 between the rotated and unrotated solutions; (3) The factor of "stuckness" was unreliable; and (4) The factor structure generally was reliable since it remained fairly constant through all mathematical manipulations.

Interpretations

The factor structure of powerlessness, then, gives one main or general factor of powerlessness. This encompasses all four of the

groups of negative emotions, plus other attributions (which might be called perceptions) of the situation: that one is out of control, caught up in emotions, the situation is unacceptable, the person is not able to be himself, no alternatives exist that are feasible, and the subject has different goals than usual. The four groups of negative emotions each have a separate factor. One likely interpretation of this is that in all situations each emotions may be present, although not in a figural or important way to the person, but in a given situation one or more of the emotions <u>are</u> figural. This would account for both the emotions clustering together in the first factor, and varying separately in the later ones. It is interesting to note that the factor of "angry" indicates also a mobility - a search for alternatives, whereas the "inward pulling" emotions of depression and the like also have high loadings with items such as "caught up in the situation," or "no acceptable alternatives." Thus, it seems that there are different ways in which different people meet different situations. The factor of being immobile or being stuck may also play a part in the experience; as this conceptually makes sense, it is included in the description of the experience, although the reader should keep in mind that mathematically its presence is uncertain.

The structure of powerlessness, then, as given by the factor analysis of questions related to the experience, is as follows:

> There is a general experience of being powerless which embraces several different types of negative feelings surrounding the experience, including anger, isolation, dis-affirmation and depression. Included in the experience are certain perceptions of the situation. These

> perceptions include ones that the person is in an unacceptable situation, in which he is out of control and has no feasible alternatives, being caught up in his emotions and having different goals and concerns than he usually does.
>
> It is reasonable to believe that the four emotions may be felt in most situations; however, one or more may be more important and figural to the person. Further, it may be that in some situations another figural part of the experience is that of feeling stuck or caught - of not being able to do what one desires. There is some evidence indicating that when the person's anger is figural, he is more active and mobile - looking for alternative ways out of the situation; when depressed, he may be more passive and immobile.

This structure will be related to the phenomenological results in a later section. It is interesting here, however, to compare the results of the factor analysis with the hypothesized factors that were used in making up the questionnaire. Originally, there were four hypothesized emotions - depression, anger, isolation, and dis-affirmation. These came out clearly in both the general and lower order factors. Two other factors were hypothesized: Out of Control and Altered State of Experiencing. Out of Control did not appear as a separate factor; however, it did appear in items loading on the general factor. This makes sense conceptually: Out-of-control-ness, in the phenomenological investigation, is found to permeate <u>every</u> experience, as does emotionality. Thus, one would expect that whereas different emotions might load onto separate factors as the different situations and responses made them more and less figural, out-of-control-ness should load only on the major, general factor of powerlessness. Altered States of Experiencing should hypothetically

have loaded somewhat on a general factor, but more importantly on a separate lower order factor (as again, this would be present more and less in different situations). This was both confirmed and rejected in the analysis. Time perception was a separate factor. However, the items of having different goals, having one's usual routine being disrupted, etc., did not load significantly on any factors. One explanation for this might be that these items were not understood well. Several subjects asked questions about these longer items, not understanding how they applied to the experience. Another possibility is that having different goals, or being disrupted in routine, is not a thematic part of the experience. As logically these seem to be part of being powerless, this would be an area in which future studies might concentrate - perhaps by reformulating questionnaire items.

Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability of the questionnaire were assessed in several ways, some more formal and others less so. Some evidence have been discussed above. The fact that the factors came out so clearly in the unrotated solution argues that these are, in fact, the actual co-variances in the data. Similarly, the close correspondence between the different solutions mathematically argues for this same conclusion. Finally, as has been noted, there was a close correspondence between the hypothesized and obtained factors.

Two more formal checks were built into the questionnaire. These were the test and retest of 22 subjects and the presencé of dummy items

in the test. The presence of dummy items served to break up the expectation sets subjects might build up in answering the questionnaire, and served to indicate whether subjects were answering the questions relative to their experience of powerlessness or according to chance, experimenter expectation, etc. As was noted above, the dummy items factored very neatly into one factor (Factor 2), and did not appear (with one exception) in any other factors. The conclusion is that in fact some type of discriminant validity existed; subjects were discriminating between items which were associated with powerlessness and ones which were not.

Another test built into the questionnaire was the test retest reliability. This reliability estimate came out as 0.61, a correlation between the first and second tests significant at the 0.0025 level. This is not considered good test retest reliability; one would expect $r = 0.80$ and hope for $r = 0.90$ or greater. There are two explanations for this which seem reasonable. The first is mathematical: The items which were added together to give each subject one score for the reliability estimate were ones chosen as loading strongly on Factor 1 (accounting for the most variance). However, in fact these items loaded between 0.36 and 0.60, with a mean loading of 0.47. Since the items did not load onto the factor in an extemely high fashion, they did not share an extremely high amount of variance. This being the case, adding them together may have, in some cases, lessened the overall reliability. (However, these were the items which did co-vary the most; the only other possibility would have been to use the dummy items which would not have been informative.)

The other possible reason for lower test retest reliability than expected is that many subjects reported that they had thought further about the situation they reported since the first time they took the questionnaire. In thinking about it further, it is reasonable to assume that they might have remembered further perceptions or emotions that they felt. If this is the case, then their answers on the questionnaire would reflect this and the reliability would decrease. If this is the case, however, one would conclude that the first answers were probably not wrong, per se, but rather later answers were more complete and would add more data. In other words, in one reason for differences is that subjects thought more about the experience, it would be much more likely for them to remember things they forgot than to realize that something they previously remembered was not actually so. Two conclusions follow from this: (1) The test retest reliability should be considered when examining the factor analytic results; and (2) A further study in which subjects either answered a questionnaire before the real questionnaire, or were led is some other way to think about the experience beforehand would be valuable.

Variations of the Analysis

Two variations of the analysis were described above: the analysis of subjects broken down by sex, and broken down by type of situation. As the number of subjects was low, no conclusions can be drawn from these data. However, they can be used as tentative conclusions from which hypotheses can be made for further testing.

In the analysis by sex, it was noted that basically the same factors appeared for men, women, and all subjects. They were in slightly different order, but each factor appeared (or in one case a related factor appeared). The interesting point to note was the combinations of items within factors. For instance, for all subjects, the items indicating anger were associated with mobility - the search for alternative ways out of the situation. For the men alone, anger appeared by itself, and for women, anger was associated with being dis-affirmed and with feeling thwarted. The question arises as to the association of these states and feelings. Are they artifacts of the low number of subjects (e.g., 88 male subjects), or do they point to a difference in the associations of emotions in the experience of powerlessness? If so, is there a similar association in other experiences?

The analysis of factors by situation is similarly interesting but even more fraught with unreliability - there were only 39 physical situations of powerlessness analysed, and thus those results should be used even for hypotheses with care. One interesting difference in these analyses was that whereas for all subjects, being angry was associated with being mobile, in the physical situations being angry was associated with feeling "prevented" in some way. This would make sense considering the nature of the physical prevention in these situations. In the other situations - which usually included more or a personal loss or emotional involvement - being angry was usually associated with being mis-understood. Looking at the different categories of situations, it can be seen

that many of these situations involved the loss of a lover or relative, being told what to do, or being arrested. Certainly in many of these cases (aside from the deaths) it would seem that an element of misunderstanding might exist. In all situations and other situations alone/insecure is the factor accounting for the most variance, whereas for the physical situations it is the angry factor. This makes sense on a prima facie basis and might serve as a hypothesis for further studies to investigate. Certainly this relates to the phenomenological results and indicates that the phenomenological structure should not be overgeneralized to apply to all situations.

Combination of Results

Two separate analyses of the structure of the experience of powerlessness have now been presented. Each of these analyses has its characteristic area of strength; each one is weak in certain areas. This section will discuss the way each study adds to and informs the results found in the other study. Further modifications will be suggested which would enable the experiments to be re-done to give additional data and an integrated structure of powerless experiencing.

Discussion of Phenomenological Results

There are two primary ways in which the factor analytic results add to and modify the findings of the phenomenological study. These include the areas of quantifications and validity, and the range and generalizability of the results. The phenomenological study completely omits statistics, preferring not to quantify results. To a certain extent this gives this approach its characteristic power (as discussed below); however, certain disadvantages also accrue when this is done. Generally, these disadvantages can be characterized as a lack of ability to estimate the validity and reliability of results. Without quantification of results (and accompanying error estimates), the reader is left without any proof of the conclusions reached. He has no basis for accepting or rejecting

the results (aside from his own personal opinion of their validity). Thus, one way in which the factor analytic study added to the phenomenological results was that it provided a certain amount of statistical support for the results. Thus, the fact that factors were obtained which included a general factor of powerlessness, plus factors of dis-affirmation, angry/mobility, depression and isolation, were evidences for the validity of the phenomenological results. This is especially true since most of the questionnaire items came directly from the fundamental description of powerlessness.

However, a main fault of weakness in the phenomenological analysis was also brought to light through the factor analytic study. It seemed clear that there were different ways in which people experienced being powerless according to their specific situation. For instance, in the 39 physical situations, the mean scores for items loading on dis-affirmation (dis-affirmed, good for nothing, useless, worthless) was 3.0; for "other" situation it was 3.7. It seems intuitively reasonable that a person breaking up with a lover or spouse, being ordered by his parents to do something against his will, or not getting into medical school would feel much more dis-affirmed than the victim of a car wreck. Additionally, the probable interpretation of the lower order factors of dis-affirmation, isolation, stuckness, etc., is that they play a greater part in some situations than others. Thus, the factor analysis suggests that the phenomenological results have a degree of validity; however, they probably do not apply as well to each type of situation of powerlessness. People use the term "powerlessness" to describe their feelings in many

different situations. The phenomenological investigation suggested (without being able to prove) that all these situations had a common fundamental description. The factor analysis suggests that this fundamental description may not have this high degree of generalizability.

We may take this suggestion, as it were, from the factor analytic results and apply it in two ways. First, it should be possible to vary the phenomenological methodology utilized to account for this (as is discussed further below). Second, it should also be possible to re-examine the protocols of powerlessness and see which protocols (and thus which types of situations) are being best described in the fundamental structure and fundamental description. The protocols given in Chapter IV included situations of car vandalism, death of a relative, a boat sinking, a husband's depression, parents telling the subject what to do (2), a friend's serious illness, and inability to complete a dissertation (!). It seems that in a certain sense, being dis-affirmed has to do (in the phenomenological structure) with an important part of a person's self-concept being denied. Thus, perhaps most clearly with the two girls, the construct they had (if we may use Kelley's language for a moment) of being independent - to give it a name - was shattered when they were forced to do or not do something by their parents. In this sense they might feel dis-affirmed. We might consider other situations, such as a car wreck. It would be doubtful that any self conception or construct would be being denied in this type of situation; however, it is possible. In the boat sinking incident, the subject might have had the construct of <u>competence</u> - that he is a very competent person and

enjoys impressing his friends with this. In this case, the very physical powerlessness might represent much more to him than physical danger. (Of course, he might well not have this construct.) Similarly, with the car vandalism, I (as the subject) had a construct of control - of needing to be in control of the "well-being," as it were, of my automobile. In each case, if the subject had or has a vested interest in retaining this construct, if he needed to control his property's well-being, demonstrate his competence in boat handling, assert her independence, then in that sense he/she would be being dis-affirmed.

Thus, the factor analytic results indicate that, while the phenomenological interpretation of powerlessness has a certain validity, it probably only applies to certain powerless experiencing. It leads to a re-examination of the phenomenological data which, at least hypothetically, may suggest that the dis-affirmation may occur as personal constructs important to the person are denied; thus, we might hypothesize that certain types of powerlessness would be dis-affirming for most people, other classes of situations would not be dis-affirming for most, and other situations would depend more on the person and his particular needs (or put phenomenologically, his pre-reflective projects). This, again, constitutes a hypothesis which could then be tested further (as discussed below).

Discussion of Factor Analytic Results

We have seen that the factor analysis added to the phenomenological results in the areas of validity and limiting the over-generalization

of the phenomenological description and structure. We might say, then, that the strength of the factor analysis lies in its breadth - its statistical sampling of many subjects and mathematical treatment of the data. Correspondingly, the strength of the phenomenological study lies in the depth that it has - in some senses to a much greater degree than present in the factor analytic studies alone. The factor analytic method gives a great deal of information about powerlessness, but the phenomenological analysis can speak to what that information means, the deeper structures and meanings of the experience for the client or subject.

We may examine this first in the nature of the questionnaire and its application. A questionnaire, by its nature, has objective answers. (This is not true of all questionnaires, but is true of ones such as this which serve for a mathematical analysis.) There is no "sort of," no "well, yes, in one way I do agree, but in another way I do not." The strength of objective answers, as noted, is that they provide the possibility of quantification, leading to reliability, validity, etc. The corresponding weakness is that the subjects' experience cannot be explored in more depth. We cannot say, "In what way do you agree, and in what way don't you?"

Because of this, certain ideas were lost in the factor analytic study. For instance, one item in the questionnaire had to do with being thwarted in something one wanted to do. Many subjects I spoke with informally told me that they did not feel that a car accident "thwarted them in an intended goal or project." As we talked about it together, I realized that what the subject meant was that he or she

had no particular thematic goal in mind. Since they did not consciously think about arriving safely, they did not consider that they had been prevented in a goal. I, on the other hand, had pre-reflective projects in mind as well as conscious ones. In a phenomenological investigation, opportunity would be provided in the dialogue of the interview to work out different ways of seeing the situation (such as this). The questionnaire format leaves little space for the clarification of mis-understanding, the "yes, but..." or the partial agreement. In this way the phenomenological study adds depth to the results of the factor analysis.

Another addition provided by the phenomenological study was in the depth of contact with the individual subject, and the pysychological implications of this. Subjects for the factor analysis were, as noted previously, primarily Psychology 201 students, unknown to the experimenter. This added to the reliability of the results. This "unknown" quality, and the sheer number of subjects needed, had attendent disadvantages. The students were filling out the questionnaire because they were required to have four hours of experimental credit to pass the course, rather than because they, like me, honestly wanted to find out more about powerlessness (as was more the case with subjects in the phenomenological study). The students were, by in large, not interested in participating. One example of this was that when students were told that following the questionnaire the experimenter would be available to talk about the results of the study, how it (or other questionnaires) were/are constructed and personality research in general, over 95% of the subjects opted to leave directly

after finishing their task (even when they had to stay until everyone was finished), and only 2% of the subjects (in group or individual runs) expressed interest in the experiment or results - others were interested in how to get into graduate school or humanistic psychology. Another example is that it was observed that well over half of the subjects (especially when run in groups) fairly "zipped" down the paper, filling out items with very little obvious reflection. Frequently, when examining the filled out questionnaires, contradictions were apparent: People said that they were not allowed to go out with a certain boy/girl and then answered that they were not thwarted in something they wished to do; situations which seemed very important to the person and unusual (e.g., death of a relative, break-up with girl/boyfriend) were not marked as significant or disruptive to normal routine.

Of course, this critique is more a general one than specific to this particular study. To obtain 200 volunteers without using something like the Psychology subject pool would be unwieldy at best, and thus, many or most psychology graduate student experiments employ it when using large numbers of subjects. However, it does throw some doubts on the results. In fact, it seems on examining the questionnaires that certain items which are conceptually more difficult (using more complicated words like "reflective," or groups of words) were not attended to as much as were simpler adjectives. In factoring the results, then, one might experience errors - not in believing positive responses - but in believing that negative responses imply the absence of the experience.

The second way in which the phenomenological study adds to the factor analytic one is in giving meaning and structure to the findings of it. The results of the factor analysis are several factors - in this case about 7 or 8 - each of which consists of a statement, as it were, that several items do co-vary together, and a factor name which is constructed from examining the items. The factor structure does not tell us what the relationships between items are within a factor, nor what the relationships between factors are. Does the subject feel alone and angry? Does he feel one in some situations and the other in other situations? Is "dis-affirmed" present in the experience in exactly the same way as is "angry?" Answers to these questions are not given in the factor analysis. Constructing a cohesive description of powerlessness using only the factor analytic results (as was done in the previous chapter) is done on the basis of the interpretations of the experimenter - what he thinks the factors might mean. Thus, a statement that out-of-control-ness is present in every situation but is not consciously thought of, would be made on the basis of the experimenter looking at his own experience, but not by what is given in the data.

The phenomenological analysis adds depth in the sense of providing a structure for these items or bits of experience. The phenomenological analysis can state, for instance, that dis-affirmation is present in the sense of being the underlying (perhaps pre-reflective) meaning of the situation. It might state (hypothetically speaking) that being out of control is constricting for the subject, to which he responds either

by rejecting this constriction and bursting out with anger, or accepting it with the further constriction (pulling inwards) of depression. In this way, some sense of structure - some relationship - between the two items (or factors) is provided. This is not possible in the questionnaire. If it were asked directly, what would result would only be the subject's theories on the subject: "I guess maybe that was it." Surely, in one sense, the phenomenologist is doing the same thing. However, his "guesses" are of a more disciplined type, his reflections include techniques which attempt to bring the experience itself to light and eliminate as many preguesses as possible.

Dialogue

And thus we begin to see, in an exemplified fashion, the way in which these two methodologies can interweave. The power of the factor analytic methodology is its breadth - its statements about which situations we may say have which "items" of experience, its estimates of validity and reliability of results, the precision which it brings to the understanding of the phenomenon. The dialogue begins as this factor analysis builds from the results of the phenomenological analysis. It continues as the phenomenological analysis can be brought to bear on the factor analytic results - giving them meaning and providing the structure of interrelationships between the items and factors. The factor analytic study asks enough subjects so that we may rely on the results and know their limitations. The phenomenological analysis asks subjects enough so that we may

understand their experiences completely. Each of them has its characteristic language, and each language bears upon the concern and strength of that methodology. Eschewing causality, the phenomenological study uses metaphor to bring the experience to life for us. Being precise and quantitative, the factor analytic results give us more assurances that we are not being merely subjective.

The next step in the dialogue is the integration of results. As of yet, this is not possible. The phenomenological results were based on data which the factor analysis informs us was not of a homogenous type (i.e., physical versus other situations). The factor analysis did not include enough subjects so that a separate analysis that could be relied on for each type of situation was possible. However, directions for future study are clear. First, different situations of powerlessness can now be identified. Phenomenological and factor analytic investigations - using even these same methodologies - can be undertaken for situations of physical danger, situations of illness, situations of parental orders, etc. The results from these experiments could be combined (factor analytic with phenomenological) to obtain integrated structures of the phenomenon. They could also be compared with one another to see the differences in the types of experiencing people go through in different situations. Other benefits from this projected study would included testing the hypothesis that personal constructs were being denied when the person is dis-affirmed; examining further the outward association with anger and the inward with depression (and perhaps also relationships with rejecting versus accepting the situation);

and examining possible differences between males and females. By having subjects answer questions relating to more than one situation of powerlessness, it would also be possible to investigate differences in personal styles as well as situational variables. Finally, both methodologies might be modified to investigate powerlessness which is not time limited - the long term powerlessness of ghetto blacks, of invalids, or prisoners.

Additionally, having initial results on the structure of powerlessness, it should be possible to construct similar studies of the phenomenon of power. These studies seem to be next steps towards answering our original questions: What are power and powerlessness? What part do they play in shaping our lives? How might we grow as persons, as well as helping professionals, through our increased understanding of them?

APPENDIX 1
QUESTIONNAIRE ON POWERLESSNESS

People feel powerless in many different situations. There seem to be some things that are common to these experiences, and some things which people experience quite differently. This questionnaire is an attempt to obtain some more information on these similarities and differences. I would like you to think about the powerless situation you chose and then answer the following questions, thinking back to that particular experience. If you don't understand a question, please ask for clarification. If it doesn't seem to apply to your experience, please put N/A. If you have any questions or comments about the study or the questionnaire, please jot them down at the end. Thanks.

	Not at all			Somewhat			Very much
Would you characterize the situation as:							
Disruptive to your normal routine and activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Significant to you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unreal or unbelievable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
During this experience, I felt:							
Adventurous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Alone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Angry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conservative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Depressed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Despairing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dis-affirmed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Enraged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Forgiving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Good for Nothing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hopeless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Imaginative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ingenious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Impulsive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Insecure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Irritated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Isolated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Liesurely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not understood	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Out of control	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reflective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Self confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Solitary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unsupported	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Useless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Versatile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

<u>During this experience</u>, <u>I was</u>:

Thwarted in something I wanted to do have or be	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Caught up in my emotions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Faced with something I could not prevent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not able to be myself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Faced with an unacceptable situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
During this experience:							
Time seemed to pass quickly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time seemed to pass slowly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I realized that I had no acceptable alternative courses of action	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I felt that others who weren't in the same situation couldn't really understand what I was going through	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I looked for different ways out of the situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I had different goals and concerns than the ones which usually occupy my attention	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Age____ Sex ____ Race ____ Are you from Florida?_____

Are you from a city (100,000+) _____ town (20,000 - 100,000) ____ or

rural area (under 20,000) _____? Name (optional)_____

APPENDIX 2
HYPOTHETICAL CONSTRUCTS

This appendix details the selection of items for the questionnaire, including especially the hypothesized constructs and the items that were presumed to load on each. Originally, the fundamental description of powerlessness was broken down sentence by sentence and possible items taken from it. This resulted in the following items:

everyday world
events happen normally initially
things are expected
feel familiar, at home
disruption
out of control
project thwarted
unwanted event - unpreventable

no way around obstacle
search for alternatives
realize none exist

caught up in emotions
anger
rage
depression
despair
hopelsseness

resolves with regained control
resolves with time and no control
resolves with acceptance of situation

significant to subject
internal event
external event
preventable
caused by self
caused by fate
caused by other
obstacle in path

sudden occurance
gradual occurance
unacceptable present realities

magical world
everyday projects lose importance
isolated from others
unreal situation
stuck in time
jarred from everyday world

These items were examined. Certain of them were discarded as overly metaphorical (subjects would not understand them), e.g., magical space, obstacle in path. Others were discarded because they

merely listed logical possibilities, e.g., sudden occurance versus gradual occurance.

The remaining possible questionnaire items were grouped and re-grouped. Eight factors resulted from this grouping and/or from the logical necessity of them: Emotionality (including angry, rage, depression, etc.); Altered State of Experiencing (everyday projects lose importance, isolated, unreal situation, time slows down); Out of Control (no way around obstacle, stuck in time, project thwarted, unwanted event); Resolution (last three items); Attribution of Responsibility (three items); Search for Alternatives; The Body (logical); Cognitive Components (logical); Action Taken (logical); and Importance of Projects.

Several of these were then eliminated. Factors of attribution and resolution were eliminated because the items loading on them stated all the logical possibilities and that one would be followed. Factors of The Body, Cognitive Components, and Action Taken were eliminated for lack of possible items. Cognitive Components, Action Taken, and Importance of Projects fit well into Altered State of Experiencing and Out of Control. This left three factors (these two plus emotionality). Within emotionality, four emotions were distinguished - anger, isolation, dis-affirmation and depression. Items were again examined and grouped within these factors, and other items added where necessary, to give the following grouping:

Emotionality:

Anger: anger rage (hostile) (irritated)
(parentheses indicate that other words were chosen to obtain a sufficient number of items for the construct)

Isolation: isolated alone (solitary) (lonely) (not understood)

Depression: depressed despairing hopeless (sad)

Dis-affirmation: dis-affirmed (worthless) (insecure) (useless) (good for nothing) (not able to be myself)

Altered State of Experiencing:

disruptive to routine unreal caught up in emotions faced with an unacceptable situation time seemed to pass slowly others couldn't understand what I was going through different goals and concerns

Out of Control

out of control thwarted in something I wanted to do faced with something I couldn't prevent faced with an unacceptable situation I realized I had no acceptable alternative courses of action

APPENDIX 3
MULTIPLE AFFECT
ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST
(Today Form)

DIRECTIONS

On this sheet you will find words which describe different kinds of moods and feelings. Mark an X beside the words which describe how you feel now - today. Some of the words may sound alike, but we want you to check all the words that describe your feelings. Work rapidly.

1. ___ active
2. ___ adventurous
3. ___ affectionate
4. ___ afraid
5. ___ agitated
6. ___ agreeable
7. ___ aggressive
8. ___ alive
9. ___ alone
10. ___ amiable
11. ___ amused
12. ___ angry
13. ___ annoyed
14. ___ awful
15. ___ bashful
45. ___ fit
46. ___ forlorn
47. ___ frank
48. ___ free
49. ___ friendly
50. ___ frightened
51. ___ furious
52. ___ gay
53. ___ gentle
54. ___ glad
55. ___ gloomy
56. ___ good
57. ___ good-natured
58. ___ grim
59. ___ happy
89. ___ peaceful
90. ___ pleased
91. ___ pleasant
92. ___ polite
93. ___ powerful
94. ___ quiet
95. ___ reckless
96. ___ rejected
97. ___ rough
98. ___ sad
99. ___ safe
100. ___ satisfied
101. ___ secure
102. ___ shaky
103. ___ shy

16. ___ bitter
17. ___ blue
18. ___ bored
19. ___ calm
20. ___ cautious
21. ___ cheerful
22. ___ clean
23. ___ complaining
24. ___ contented
25. ___ contrary
26. ___ cool
27. ___ cooperative
28. ___ critical
29. ___ cross
30. ___ cruel
31. ___ daring
32. ___ desperate
33. ___ destroyed
34. ___ devoted
35. ___ disagreeable
36. ___ discontented
37. ___ discouraged
38. ___ disgusted
39. ___ displeased
40. ___ energetic
41. ___ enraged
60. ___ healthy
61. ___ hopeless
62. ___ hostile
63. ___ impatient
64. ___ incensed
65. ___ indignant
66. ___ inspired
67. ___ interested
68. ___ irritated
69. ___ jealous
70. ___ joyful
71. ___ kindly
72. ___ lonely
73. ___ lost
74. ___ loving
75. ___ low
76. ___ lucky
77. ___ mad
78. ___ mean
79. ___ meek
80. ___ merry
81. ___ mild
82. ___ miserable
83. ___ nervous
84. ___ obliging
85. ___ offended
104. ___ soothed
105. ___ steady
106. ___ stubborn
107. ___ stormy
108. ___ strong
109. ___ suffering
110. ___ sullen
111. ___ sunk
112. ___ sympathetic
113. ___ tame
114. ___ tender
115. ___ tense
116. ___ terrible
117. ___ terrified
118. ___ thoughtful
119. ___ timid
120. ___ tormented
121. ___ understanding
122. ___ unhappy
123. ___ unsociable
124. ___ upset
125. ___ vexed
126. ___ warm
127. ___ whole
128. ___ wild
129. ___ willful

42. ___ enthusiastic
43. ___ fearful
44. ___ fine
86. ___ outraged
87. ___ panicky
88. ___ patient
130. ___ wilted
131. ___ worrying
132. ___ young

APPENDIX 4
ITEMS LOADING ON EACH FACTOR

TABLE 11
Unrotated Factor Analysis: Without Dummy Items

Factor 1: General Factor of Powerlessness (38% of variance)

alone	-0.47	out of control	-0.41
angry	-0.47	sad	-0.49
depressed	-0.58	solitary	-0.42
despairing	-0.56	unsupported	-0.54
dis-affirmed	-0.49	useless	-0.56
enraged	-0.48	worthless	-0.56
good for nothing	-0.45	caught up in emotions	-0.44
hopeless	-0.60	(could not prevent)	-0.27
hostile	-0.50	not able to be self	-0.45
insecure	-0.45	unacceptable situation	-0.55
irritated	-0.44	no alternatives	-0.36
isolated	-0.53	not understood	-0.40
		different goals	-0.40

Factor 2: Angry/Mobile (16% of variance)

angry	0.68	irritated	0.60
enraged	0.67	looked for ways out	0.40
hostile	0.60		

Factor 3: Dis-affirmed (10% of variance)

good for nothing	0.53	worthless	0.61
useless	0.40		

Factor 4: Depressed (9% of variance)

significant	0.32	sad	0.42
depressed	0.36	could not prevent	0.29
(despairing)	0.27		

Factor 5: Alone (7% of variance)

significant	0.32	(depressed)	0.27
alone	0.37	(solitary)	0.27

TABLE 12
Rotated Factor Analysis: Without Dummy Items

Factor 1: Alone/Insecure			
alone	-0.67	(out of control)	-0.27
dis-affirmed	-0.32	solitary	-0.67
hopeless	-0.48	unsupported	-0.47
insecure	-0.40	not able to be self	-0.27
isolated	-0.76		
Factor 2: Angry/Mobile			
angry	0.87	irritated	0.72
enraged	0.82	unacceptable situation	0.32
hostile	0.76	looked for ways out	0.31
Factor 3: Dis-affirmed			
(dis-affirmed)	0.29	(insecure)	0.29
good for nothing	0.70	useless	0.68
hopeless	0.33	worthless	0.89
Factor 4: Depressed			
depressed	0.73	useless	0.68
despairing	0.61	worthless	0.89
(out of control)	0.27		
Factor 5: Stuck			
could not prevent	0.55	no alternatives	0.61
time passing slow	0.60		
Factor 7: Search for Alternatives			
dis-affirmed	0.33	looked for ways out	0.62
out of control	0.30	different goals	0.31
unsupported	0.33		

TABLE 13
Unrotated Factor Analysis: High Eigenvalue

Factor 1: General Factor of Powerlessness (38% of variance)			
(unreal)	-0.28	out of control	-0.40
alone	-0.44	sad	-0.50

TABLE 12 - continued

Factor 1: General Factor of Powerlessness (continued)

angry	-0.49	solitary	-0.36
depressed	-0.58	unsupported	-0.51
despairing	-0.58	useless	-0.53
dis-affirmed	-0.47	worthless	-0.55
enraged	-0.48	caught up in emotions	-0.45
good for nothing	-0.46	could not prevent	-0.30
hopeless	-0.60	not able to be self	-0.43
hostile	-0.50	unacceptable situation	-0.56
insecure	-0.42	time passing slow	-0.30
irritated	-0.43	no alternatives	-0.35
isolated	-0.49	not understood	-0.38
not understood	-0.39	different goals	-0.37

Factor 2: Dummy Items (18% of variance)

adventurous	-0.43	not understood	-0.30
enthusiastic	-0.52	self confident	-0.43
imaginative	-0.60	tolerant	-0.31
impulsive	-0.53	versatile	-0.60
ingenious	-0.57	(thwarted)	-0.29
liesurely	-0.31	time passing fast	-0.41

Factor 3: Angry/Mobile (15% of variance)

angry	0.65	irritated	0.60
enraged	0.63	looked for ways out	0.36
hostile	0.57		

Factor 4: Dis-affirmed/Tolerant/Slow Time (9% of variance)

good for nothing	-0.44	worthless	-0.32
tolerant	-0.33	time passing slow	-0.42
(useless)	-0.28		

Factor 5: Dis-affirmed/Fast Time (8% of variance)

good for nothing	0.32	time passing fast	0.43
worthless	0.40		

Factor 6: Depressed/Good Feelings Towards Others (8% of variance)

significant	0.37	sad	0.44
depressed	0.35	caught up in emotions	0.30
(forgiving)	0.28		

Factor 7: Alone (5% of variance)

alone	0.38	solitary	0.35

TABLE 13
Rotated Factor Analysis: High Eigenvalue

Factor 1: Alone/Insecure

alone	-0.67	isolated	-0.34
(dis-affirmed)	-0.29	solitary	-0.63
hopeless	-0.47	unsupported	-0.43
insecure	-0.34		

Factor 2: Dummy Items

adventurous	-0.51	ingenious	-0.56
(conservative)	-0.28	liesurely	-0.37
forgiving	-0.61	(reflective)	-0.27
enthusiastic	-0.40	self confident	-0.51
imaginative	-0.58	tolerant	-0.50
impulsive	-0.38	versatile	-0.69

Factor 3: Angry/Mobile/Unsupported

angry	0.82	unsupported	0.30
enraged	0.77	thwarted	0.33
hostile	0.76	(unacceptable situation)	0.29
irritated	0.80	looked for ways out	0.39
(not understood)	0.27		

Factor 4: Dis-affirmed/Depressed

depressed	-0.30	insecure	-0.33
dis-affirmed	-0.36	useless	-0.65
good for nothing	-0.76	worthless	-0.81
hopeless	-0.35		

Factor 5: Time Perception

time passing slow	-0.83	no alternatives	-0.30

Factor 6: Depressed/Mobile

significant	0.47	sad	0.57
depressed	0.53	looked for ways out	0.32
despairing	0.34		

Factor 7: Disrupted/Prevented/Depressed

disrupted	-0.37	out of control	-0.39
unreal	-0.38	sad	-0.30
depressed	-0.30	unacceptable situation	-0.50
despairing	-0.31	different goals	-0.48

TABLE 14
Rotated Factor Analysis: Males Only

Factor 1: Alone/Insecure			
alone	-0.81	unsupported	-0.41
insecure	-0.38	not able to be self	-0.38
isolated	-0.84	not understood	-0.44
solitary	-0.75		
Factor 2: Dummy Items			
adventurous	0.59	liesurely	0.36
conservative	0.37	(not understood)	0.27
enthusiastic	0.66	self confident	0.53
imaginative	0.57	tolerant	0.31
impulsive	0.47	versatile	0.76
ingenious	0.68	thwarted	0.41
Factor 3: Angry			
angry	-0.91	hostile	-0.80
enraged	-0.83	irritated	-0.78
Factor 4: Dis-affirmed/Depressed			
depressed	0.33	insecure	0.34
dis-affirmed	0.31	useless	0.79
good for nothing	0.61	worthless	0.88
hopeless	0.39		
Factor 5: Time Perception			
time passing fast	-0.75	time passing slow	0.88
Factor 6: Disruption of Normal Life			
disruption	-0.75	unable to be self	-0.34
significant	-0.37		
Factor 7: Depressed/Thwarted			
depressed	0.68	thwarted	0.34
despairing	0.45	caught up in situation	0.30
sad	0.73		

TABLE 15
Rotated Factor Analysis: Females Only

Factor 1: Alone/Insecure			
alone	0.50	isolated	0.68
hopeless	0.43	solitary	0.70
insecure	0.38	unsupported	0.47
Factor 2: Dummy Items			
adventurous	-0.34	tolerant	-0.59
enthusiastic	-0.61	versatile	-0.62
forgiving	-0.53	time passing fast	-0.35
liesurely	-0.39		
Factor 3: Angry/Unsupported			
angry	-0.77	not understood	-0.30
(despairing)	-0.27	unsupported	-0.42
dis-affirmed	-0.30	thwarted	-0.33
enraged	-0.79	unacceptable situation	-0.38
hostile	-0.75	looked for ways out	-0.40
irritated	-0.75		
Factor 4: Depressed			
depressed	0.83	sad	0.57
despairing	0.54		
Factor 5: Time Perception			
time passing slow	0.83	time passing slow	-0.82
Factor 6: Search for Alternatives			
unacceptable situation	0.32	different goals	0.51
looked for ways out	0.53		
Factor 7: Dis-affirmed			
good for nothing	0.80	useless	0.67
hopeless	0.33		

TABLE 16
Rotated Factor Analysis: Physical Situations

Factor 1: Angry/Prevented			
angry	-0.82	useless	-0.31
enraged	-0.89	thwarted	-0.38
hostile	-0.71	not able to be self	-0.34
irritated	-0.80	unacceptable situation	-0.44

TABLE 16 - continued

Factor 2: Not Understood/Alone/Thwarted/Hopeless			
alone	-0.50	not understood	-0.59
(dis-affirmed)	-0.28	thwarted	-0.41
hopeless	-0.37	caught up in emotions	-0.32
impulsive	-0.76	not understood	-0.38
Factor 3: Depressed/Insecure			
depressed	0.67	sad	0.77
good for nothing	0.40	could not prevent	0.31
insecure	0.34		
Factor 4: Time Perception			
time passing slow	0.95	(opposite)	
no alternatives	0.31	time passing fast	-0.79
Factor 5: Dummy Items			
forgiving	0.56	tolerant	0.77
ingenious	0.43	versatile	0.71
self confident	0.40	(could not prevent)	0.29
Factor 6: Dis-affirmed			
dis-affirmed	-0.53	useless	-0.73
good for nothing	-0.51	worthless	-0.91
(hopeless)	-0.28	could not prevent	-0.32
Factor 7: Alone/Unsupported			
alone	0.53	unsupported	0.32
insecure	0.30	not able to be self	0.31
isolated	0.60	not understood	0.38
solitary	0.83		

TABLE 17

Rotated Factor Analysis: Other Situations

Factor 1: Alone/Insecure			
alone	0.72	irritated	0.50
dis-affirmed	0.32	solitary	0.70
hopeless	0.50	unsupported	0.48
insecure	0.40	not understood	0.38

TABLE 17 - continued

Factor 2: Dummy Items			
adventurous	-0.43	tolerant	-0.49
enthusiastic	-0.73	versatile	-0.35
forgiving	-0.32	time passing fast	-0.30
liesurely	-0.43		
Factor 3: Angry/Misunderstood			
angry	0.89	irritated	0.74
dis-affirmed	0.30	unsupported	0.31
enraged	0.84		
hostile	0.74		
Factor 4: Dis-affirmed			
good for nothing	0.64	worthless	0.91
insecure	0.32	(not able to be self)	0.29
useless	0.63		
Factor 5: Time Perception/Out of Control			
could not prevent	0.67	no alternatives	0.67
time passing slow	0.43		
Factor 6: Disruption of Normal Life			
conservative	-0.37	looked for ways out	-0.37
not able to be self	-0.40	different goals	-0.58

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, A. Understanding human nature. Garden City, N.Y.: Garden City Publishing Co., 1927.

The psychology of power. 1928. J. Individual Psychology, 1966, 22, 166-172.

Amerikaner, M. Construct Validity and the Personality Orientation Inventory, unpublished.

Barrell, J. J., & Barrell, J. E. A self directed approach to the study of human experience. J. Phenomenological Psychology, 1975, 6, 63-75.

Barton, A. Three worlds of therapy. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1974.

Berle, A. Power. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1969.

Binswanger, L. The existential analysis school of thought. In R. May, E. Angel, & H. Ellenberger, Existence. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958, 191-213.

Bruck, W. An approach and method to phenomenological research in psychology. Unpublished area paper, University of Florida, 1976.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1963.

Colaizzi, P. Reflection and research in psychology: A phenomenological study of learning. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1973.

Felker, C. (Ed.), The power game. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1969.

Fischer, C. T. On the way to psychological assessment as human science. Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Puslishing, undated.

Fischer, W. F. Theories of anxiety. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

The problem of unconscious motivation. In A. Giorgi, W. F. Fischer, & R. von Eckartsburg (Eds.), Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology, Vol. 1. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1971, 247-258.

Frankl, V. E. The doctor and the soul: From psychotherapy to logotherapy. New York: Random House, Inc., 1973.

Gamson, W. A. Power and discontent. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Giorgi, A. Psychology as a human science. New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1970.

Phenomenology and experimental psychology I and II. In A. Giorgi, W. F. Fischer, & R. von Eckartsburg (Eds.), Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology, Vol. 1. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1971, 1-63.

Gough, W. Multiple Affect Adjective Checklist. San Diego, California: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1965.

Haley, J. The power tactics of Jesus Christ and other essays. New York: Grossman, 1969.

Handley, A. A. Construct validation of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, 1976.

Heidegger, M. Being and time (J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson, trans.). New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1962.

Husserl, E. The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology (D. Carr, trans.). Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Cartesian Meditations (D. Cairns, trans.). The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

Jourard, S. Self disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.

Keen, E. A primer in phenomenological psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.

Kwant, R. G. Encounter (R. C. Adolfs, trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1965.

Lasswell, R. Power and Society. New Haven, Conneticut: Yale University Press, 1950.

Levine, M. Hypothesis behavior by humans during discrimination learning. J. Experimental Psychology, 1966, 71, 331-338.

Hypothesis theory and nonlearning despite ideal S-R reinforcement contingencies. Psychological Review, 1971, 78, 130-140.

Luijpen, W. A. Existential phenomenology (Rev. ed.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969.

McClelland, D. C. Power, the inner experience. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality (2nd. ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

May, R. Power and innocence: A search for the sources of violence. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1972.

Merleau-Ponty, M. The phenomenology of perception (C. Smith, trans.). New York: Humanities Press, 1962.

The structure of behavior (A. L. Fisher, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

The primacy of perception (J. M. Edie, trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964.

Minton, H. L. Power as a personality construct. In B. A. Maher (ed.), Progress in experimental personality research, Vol. 4. New York and London: Academic Press, 1967, 229-267.

Nietzsche, F. Thus spoke Zarathustra. In W. Kaufman (ed. and trans.), The portable Nietzsche. New York: Viking Press, 1954.

The will to power: A revaluation of values (W. Kaufman and R. J. Hollingdale, trans., W. Kaufman, ed.). New York: Random House, Inc., 1967.

Perls, F. Gestalt therapy verbatim. Lafayette, California: Real People Press, 1969.

Pittman, N. L. The effects of helplessness training and internal-external locus of control on mood and performance. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, 1976.

Reisman, D. The lonely crowd: A study of the changing American character. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Russell, B. Power, a new social analysis. London: Allen & Unwin, 1938.

Sampson, R. V. The psychology of power. London: Heineman Educational Books, Ltd., 1965.

Sartre, J. P. Being and Nothingness (H. E. Barnes, trans.). New York: Washington Square Press, 1966.

Seeman, M. On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 783-791.

Seligman, M. Helplessness: On depression, development and death. San Fransisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1975.

Sidman, M. Tactics of scientific research. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Shapiro, D. Neurotic Styles. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Sorokin, R. A. & Lunden, W. A. Power and Morality. Boston: Peter Sargent Publishers, 1959.

Stevick, E. An empirical investigation of the experience of anger. In A. Giorgi, W. F. Fischer, & R. von Eckartsburg (Eds.), Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology, Vol. 1. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1971, 132-148.

Tillich, P. Love, power and justice: Ontological analysis and ethical implications. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

van Kaam, A. Existential foundations of psychology. Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1969.

von Eckartsburg, R. An approach to experiential social psychology. In A. Giorgi, W. F. Fischer, & R. von Eckartsburg (Eds.), Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology, Vol. I. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1971.

Watts, A. W. The book (On the taboo against knowing who you really are). New York: Collier Books, 1967.

Winter, D. C. The power motive. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.

Wylie, R. The self concept, Vol. 1 (Rev. ed.). Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Zuckerman, M., and Lubin, B. Manual for the Multiple Affect Adjective Checklist. San Diego, California: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1965.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

William A. Bruck was born on August 1, 1951, in Dayton, Ohio, and grew up in McLean, Virginia - a suburb of Washington, D.C. He attended Brown University, obtaining his A.B. degree in 1973 with honors in Human Studies - an interdisciplinary concentration program in humanistic thought. His concentration in "Social Ethics" combined religious studies, philosophy, psychology and university courses. Following this he attended Duquesne University, studying existential-phenomenological human science psychology, and obtained his M.A. in 1974 in clinical psychology. The next two years were spent at the University of Florida taking courses for his Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology. He interned at the University of Maryland Counseling Center in 1976-1977, and returned to Gainesville to complete his dissertation.

In addition to his academic interests, he has studied martial arts for eight years, holds a first degree black belt in Tae Kwon Do, and presently studies Aikido and raja yoga. He plays folk guitar and is a science fiction fan.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Harry Grater, Chairman
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jeffner Allen
Assistant Professor of Philosophy

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Franz Epting
Associate Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert Ziller
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Marilyn Zweig

Marilyn Zweig
Associate Professor of Philosophy

This thesis was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Psychology in the College of Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

December 1977

_____

Dean, Graduate School

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 08553 6729